

Row

THE CHURCH OF SAN MARCO IN VENICE

HISTORY · ARCHITECTURE · SCULPTURE

OTTO DEMUS

PRESIDENT OF THE AUSTRIAN
MONUMENTS AND FINE ARTS SERVICE
PROFESSOR AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA

With a Contribution by
FERDINANDO FORLATI
PROTO DI SAN MARCO

The Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection
Trustees for Harvard University
Washington, District of Columbia

1960

*All Rights reserved by the
Trustees for Harvard University
The Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection
Washington, D.C.*

DUMBARTON OAKS STUDIES

“ VI ”

THE CHURCH OF SAN MARCO IN VENICE

HISTORY · ARCHITECTURE · SCULPTURE



Preface

The present study was first conceived as an introductory chapter to a book on the mosaics of San Marco. Soon, however, it became evident to me that the material which I intended to present in this chapter was so vast, and the problems arising out of it so complicated, that a more thorough investigation was needed. The mosaics of San Marco could not be properly studied without close reference to the building which they decorate; and the building itself could not be understood without an investigation of the historical and sociological conditions which led to its construction and which gave it its final shape and function. In addition to this, I found it necessary to write a chapter on the sculpture of San Marco, not only because the basilica would have been a very different building without its sculptural decoration, but also because a discussion of the iconographic significance of the sculpture and the stylistic trends embodied therein will form a very suitable introduction to a monograph on the mosaic decoration—a monograph which, it is hoped, will follow soon after the present volume.

For having been able at all to embark on this work, I have to thank a number of persons in the old and new worlds. My thanks are due, first of all, to the Director of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Harvard University, Dr. John S. Thacher, the present Director of Studies, Professor Ernst Kitzinger, and his predecessors Professors Sirarpie Der Nersessian and the late A. M. Friend, Jr.; to my colleagues at this institution who have favored me with their advice; to Dr. Cyril Mango, who undertook the task of editing my manuscript, and, for their additional help, to Miss J. Warner and Mrs. J. Southcote-Aston.

I owe a great debt of gratitude to the Federal Minister of Education of Austria, Dr. H. Drimmel, for granting me repeated leaves of absence from my work in Vienna, and to the officials of the Ministry, especially Dr. E. Thahammer, for making these absences possible without detriment to the Service; to my deputy, Hofrat Dr. E. Hainisch who on these several occasions took over my duties; and to my collaborators in the Austrian Monuments Service for continuing and even intensifying their strenuous work during my absence. I should like also to express my obligation to the Italian authorities and colleagues who furthered my work in Venice: to the Ecclesiastical authorities; to the Proto of San Marco, Commendatore Ferdinando Forlati who, in addition,

contributed to this work a valuable chapter; to the Istituto di Storia dell'arte of the Fondazione Giorgio Cini; to the Directors of the Venetian museums and galleries and to the Soprintendente ai Monumenti. Finally, I should like to thank my wife, Dr. Margarete Demus, for much help and unvarying understanding.

I am only too conscious that this book has shortcomings, but would plead that it is the first attempt of its kind since the appearance of the great monograph on San Marco in the eighties of the last century. If I have failed to refer to some recent studies, it is because my manuscript was, in the main, completed in 1955. I shall be content if this work promotes discussions of subjects and problems which have too long lain dormant.

April, 1960

Otto Demus

Table of Contents

PREFACE	v
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	ix
BOOK ONE	
HISTORY. THE SAINT, THE CHURCH, AND THE STATE	I
I. Introductory Note	3
II. St. Mark and the Apostles	3
III. The Relics of St. Mark	7
IV. St. Mark and St. Theodore: Venice and Byzantium	19
V. St. Mark and St. Hermagoras: Venice, Grado, and Aquileia	30
VI. St. Mark and the Doge	44
BOOK TWO	
ARCHITECTURE	61
I. The Predecessors of San Marco	63
II. The First Church of San Marco	64
III. The Orseoli Church	69
IV. The Contarini Church	70
1. <i>Documents and Dates</i>	70
2. <i>Analysis and Reconstruction</i>	75
3. <i>Character of the Contarini Church; San Marco and the</i> <i>Apostoleion</i>	88
4. <i>Façades</i>	100
BOOK THREE	
SCULPTURE	107
I. Introduction. The Role of Sculpture in San Marco	109
II. Venetian Sculpture before 1200	115
1. <i>Interlaced Patterns and Rinceaux</i>	115
2. <i>Lombardo-Emilian Sculpture</i>	117

III. Venetian Sculpture in the Early Thirteenth Century	118
1. <i>The early Antelami Workshop</i>	118
2. <i>Spoils and Imports</i>	120
IV. The Assimilation of Foreign Models and the Birth of Venetian Sculpture	123
1. <i>The Influence of Byzantine Sculpture</i>	123
2. <i>The Byzantinizing Current and the Antelami Workshop</i>	125
3. <i>Protorenaissance Sculpture</i>	165
4. <i>Romanesque Sculpture in the Round</i>	183
V. The Synthesis of Gothic and Palaealogan Elements	187
APPENDICES	
THE WORK OF RESTORATION IN SAN MARCO by <i>Ferdinando Forlati</i> ..	193
LIST OF DOGES	203
CHRONOLOGICAL SYNOPSSES	205
History	205
Architecture	206
Sculpture	208
BIBLIOGRAPHY	209
INDEX	231
PLATES	237

List of Illustrations

1. San Marco. Ground Plan (Opera di San Marco).
2. West Façade (photo Böhm).
3. South Façade (photo Alinari).
4. South Transept, Exterior (photo Demus).
5. North Façade (after *La Basilica di San Marco*).
6. North Façade, without Marble Revetment (after *La Basilica di San Marco*).
7. North Transept, Exterior (photo Alinari).
8. North Façade, detail, Relief of Fortuna (photo Alinari).
9. Gentile Bellini, Procession (photo Rossi).
10. Porta Sant'Alipio, Mosaic (photo Alinari).
11. Atrium, Pozzo (photo Böhm).
12. Interior, South Transept (photo Naya-Böhm).
13. Atrium, West Wing, looking South (photo Alinari).
14. Atrium, North Wing, looking East (photo Alinari).
15. Interior, looking East (photo Alinari).
16. Interior, Pulpit and Cappella San Pietro (photo Alinari).
17. Interior, Vault of Cappella San Pietro (photo Naya-Böhm).
18. Interior, North Aisle of West Wing (photo Alinari).
19. Interior, South Aisle of West Wing (photo Böhm).
20. Crypt, Ground Plan (after Cattaneo).
21. Interior, Mouldings of Arch (photo Demus).
22. Interior and Atrium Capitals (photo Alinari).
23. Interior, Console and Protomes (photo Demus).
24. West Façade, Relief with Peacocks (photo Alinari).
25. Exterior, South Wall of Tesoro (photo Böhm).
26. Sepulchre of Felicitas Michiel (photo Böhm).
27. Sepulchre of Felicitas Michiel, detail, Screen (photo Böhm).
28. Sepulchre of Vitale Falieri, detail, Screen (photo Böhm).
29. Sepulchre of Felicitas Michiel, detail, Tree with Birds (photo Böhm).
30. Interior, Panel from North Balustrade of West Arm (photo Kunsthistorisches Institut, Marburg).
31. Fragment of Frieze, with Inhabited Scroll (photo Opera di San Marco).
32. South Aisle, Deesis (photo Alinari).

33. North Façade, Alexander (photo Alinari).
34. Cappella della Nicopeia, Relief with Saints (photo Böhm).
35. Cappella Zeno, Virgin Aniketos (photo Alinari).
36. North Aisle, Madonna della Grazia (photo Böhm).
37. North Transept, Orant Virgin (photo Alinari).
38. West Façade, Heracles with the Boar (photo Alinari).
39. West Façade, Heracles with the Hind (photo Alinari).
40. West Façade, St. Demetrius (photo Alinari).
41. West Façade, St. George (photo Alinari).
42. West Façade, Archangel Gabriel (photo Alinari).
43. West Façade, Orant Virgin (photo Alinari).
44. North Façade, Christ (photo Naya-Böhm).
45. North Façade, St. Luke the Evangelist (photo Naya-Böhm).
46. North Façade, St. Matthew (photo Naya-Böhm).
47. North Façade, St. Mark (photo Naya-Böhm).
48. North Façade, St. John the Evangelist (photo Naya-Böhm).
49. North Façade, St. Leonard (photo Alinari).
50. Ciborium, Northeast Column (I), detail (photo Böhm).
51. Ciborium, Southeast Column (III), detail (photo Böhm).
52. Ciborium, Northwest Column (II), detail (photo Böhm).
53. Ciborium, Southwest Column (IV), detail (photo Böhm).
54. Ciborium, Northwest Column (II), detail (photo Böhm).
55. Ciborium, Northwest Column (II), detail (photo Böhm).
56. Porta Sant'Alipio, Lintel, detail (photo Naya-Böhm).
57. Cappella delle Reliquie, *Traditio legis* (photo Alinari).
58. Atrium, Sarcophagus of Marino Morosini (photo Alinari).
59. Cappella delle Reliquie, Christ borne by Angels (photo Opera di San Marco).
60. North Façade, Hetoimasia and Lambs (photo Alinari).
61. Cappella Zeno, Nativity (photo Böhm).
62. North Façade, Sacrifice of Isaac (photo Naya-Böhm).
63. West Façade, Second Bronze Door from right, detail (photo Böhm).
64. Ciborium Roof, Seated Evangelist (photo Böhm).
65. West Façade, Central Porch, General View (photo Alinari).
66. West Façade, Central Porch, Inner Arches (photo Alinari).
67. Central Porch, detail, two Arches (photo Alinari).
68. Central Porch, Soffit of First Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
69. Central Porch, Soffit of First Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
70. Central Porch, Soffit of First Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
71. Central Porch, Soffit of First Arch, detail (photo Alinari).

72. Central Porch, Front of First Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
73. Central Porch, Front of First Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
74. Central Porch, Soffit of Second Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
75. Central Porch, Soffit of Second Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
76. Central Porch, Soffit of Second Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
77. Central Porch, Soffit of Second Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
78. Central Porch, Front of Second Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
79. Central Porch, Front of Second Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
80. Central Porch, Soffit of Third Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
81. Central Porch, Soffit of Third Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
82. Central Porch, Soffit of Third Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
83. Central Porch, Soffit of Third Arch, detail (photo Alinari).
84. Central Porch, Front of Third Arch, detail (photo Opera di San Marco).
85. Central Porch, Front of Third Arch, detail (photo Opera di San Marco).
86. West Façade, First Door from South (photo Naya-Böhm).
87. West Façade, Second Door from South (photo Naya-Böhm).
88. Porta Sant'Alipio (photo Böhm).
89. Porta Sant'Alipio, detail (photo Böhm).
90. West Façade, Second Door from North, detail (photo Böhm).
91. Porta dei Fiori (photo Alinari).
92. Lunette of Tesoro Entrance (photo Naya-Böhm).
93. Porta dei Fiori, Front of Arch (photo Opera di San Marco).
94. Porta dei Fiori, Soffit of Arch (photo Böhm).
95. South Façade, Arch of former South Entrance (photo Böhm).
96. Lunette of Porta di San Giovanni (photo Böhm).
97. South Aisle, Protome (photo Demus).
98. Cappella Zeno, Lion from South Entrance (photo Böhm).
99. Central Square, Angel blowing Trumpet (photo Naya-Böhm).
100. Central Square, Angel (photo Naya-Böhm).
101. Central Porch, *Sogno di San Marco* (photo Böhm).
102. Pulpit, Angel (photo Alinari).
103. Cappella Zeno, Prophet (photo Naya-Böhm).
104. North Façade, St. Christopher (photo Alinari).
105. Baptistery, St. George (photo Alinari).
106. Baptistery, St. Theodore (photo Alinari).
107. North Transept, Madonna dello Schioppo (photo Alinari).
108. Baptistery, Baptism of Christ (photo Alinari).
109. Interior, Scaffolding (photo Opera di San Marco).
110. Vault of South Transept, partly rebuilt (photo Opera di San Marco).

- III. Strengthening of Pier with liquid cement (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II2. Renewing Cupola Superstructure (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II3. Atrium, South Lunette, after removal of Mosaic (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II4. Atrium, South Lunette, Mosaic (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II5. Cupola Superstructure, Schematic Drawing (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II6. Diagram showing method of rebuilding Vault without removing Mosaic (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II7. Vault of South Transept during Reconstruction (photo Opera di San Marco).
- II8. Vault of South Transept. Back of Mosaic, seen from above, after renewal of Vault Masonry (photo Opera di San Marco).

BOOK ONE

HISTORY

THE SAINT, THE CHURCH,
AND THE STATE

I. INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Although the pages that follow are entitled "History," Book I of this study should not be taken as an attempt to give a *précis* of Venetian history. My intention has been to provide only so much of the historical background as will be necessary for an understanding of the church of San Marco and of Venetian art in general. This art did not develop in a vacuum, but was the expression and the effect of historical forces and facts. Since most of the works of art with which this book is concerned are ecclesiastic in character, and since the building which harbors them and which is the main object of our study is a church, the main accent of this chapter will be necessarily on ecclesiastical history, or, at least, on those aspects of Venetian history which are most intimately connected with the foundation, the growth, and the subsequent fate of the ducal church.

The first of these aspects will be the hagiographical one, the question of patronia and of relics, since it leads back to times in which Venice itself did not yet exist—to a Venetian prehistory (chapters II and III). When Venice actually came into existence, it did so as a part of the Byzantine Empire. Consequently, the next chapter (IV) will deal with the relationship of Venice to Byzantium—a relationship which ran the whole gamut from subordination to domination. In chapter V the reader must necessarily be guided over the same ground once more, but from a different point of view. If the chapter on Venice and Byzantium deals to a great extent with the foreign politics of Venice, the fifth chapter probes into the ecclesiastical policy of the Serenissima. The sixth and last chapter is dedicated to clarifying the position of the church of San Marco in Venetian life and, especially, to defining the role which the doge played in his own church: it deals with interior politics and with problems of social structure.

The disadvantage of dividing the subject into several aspects is that it entails some repetition and interrupts the flow of the narrative; on the other hand, it illuminates facts and events from more than one angle and, as it were, gives them a three-dimensional appearance.

II. ST. MARK AND THE APOSTLES

From the end of the eleventh to the end of the thirteenth century, the church of San Marco was undoubtedly the most important center of religious and political life in Venice. Since the building itself and its decoration appear to have been shaped, to a great extent, by the function of the church in the Venetian Commonwealth, it is necessary to give an account of the forces and tendencies contributing to a development that began with the erection of San Marco as a palace chapel and a shrine for the relics of its tutelary Saint, and that ended with its becoming the see of a patriarchate.

Without including the prehistory of the foundation, the history of the church encompasses a period of almost a thousand years. The chronicle begins with the translation of the relics of the Evangelist to Venice in 828/9 and the subsequent building of their first shrine, and concludes with the final transfer of the patriarchate to San Marco in 1807, a measure sanctioning a *de facto* state of affairs that had, with certain qualifications, existed since the twelfth century.

The rise of San Marco, which accompanied and mirrored the rise of the Venetian Republic itself, and had, together with the latter, its apogee in the thirteenth century, started from small beginnings. At the time of its foundation, San Marco was neither a great ecclesiastical center in the sense that it was the see of an important prelate, nor was it hallowed by an old tradition. The island of Rialto itself was one of the latest settlements of the lagoons, and of the six bishoprics of Venetia proper,¹ that of Rialto (Olivolo-Castello) was the latest, not having been created until 774/5. Three of the remaining bishoprics had been transferred to the lagoons from the mainland between 600 and 640, namely, Caorle from Concordia, Heracliana-Cittanova from Opitergium, and Torcello from Altinum; whereas the other two were new foundations of the late seventh century, namely, Equilus (Jesolo) and Methamaucum (Malamocco). According to the chronicle of John the Deacon, the bishopric of Rialto-Olivolo-Castello was founded in the eleventh year of Doge Mauritius (i.e., 774/5), who ordained its first bishop Obeliebatus; the foundation heralded, or was connected with, the transfer of the seat of the government to Rialto. About the actual building or rebuilding of the new episcopal church, dedicated to St. Peter, there is great confusion in the Venetian chronicles. It is, however, probable that the church was built not long before the establishment of the episcopal see of Olivolo-Rialto and rebuilt or enlarged in the first half of the ninth century. The accounts of its erection by the Patriarch Elias of Grado (572-586) belong, in any case, to those fabrications which were so dear to Venetian chroniclers and which were meant to lend force to the ecclesiastic claims of the republic.²

Other Realtine churches may, however, have been older than St. Peter's church and certainly older than San Marco. According to popular tradition, Venetian churches had been founded as early as the fifth or sixth century. To the earlier

¹ General works on the history and organization of the Church in Venice: Cornelius Flamininus (F. Corner), *Ecclesiae Venetae*; G. Cappelletti, *Storia della chiesa di Venezia*; P. Contarini, *Venezia religiosa*; A. Rossi, *Studi di storia*; H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, p. 404 ff.; F. Lanzoni, *Le origini*, p. 490 ff.; *idem*, *Le diocesi*, p. 846 ff.; P. F. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig," p. 27 ff.

² The story of the foundation of the Bishopric of Olivolo-Rialto as related by Johannes Diaconus, *Chronicon Venetum* (ed. G. Monticolo, *Cronache*, p. 98), is correct in its main outlines. For the building or rebuilding of the church by Ursus, Bishop of Castello-Olivolo, in the first half of the ninth century, see *ibid.* p. 108, and *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, ed. L. A. Muratori, col. 168. According to the two chronicles, Bishop Ursus (whose testament of February 853 is published in R. Cessi, "Documenti," p. 114) deposited in the church the relics of its former Patron Saints, Sergius and Bacchus, whose church is said to have existed since the seventh century. The *Chronicon Gradense* (ed. Monticolo, *Cronache*, p. 44) says that the former church of Sergius and Bacchus was *ubi nunc est ecclesia Sancti Petri Apostoli*. On the episcopate of Castello-Olivolo-Rialto, see also: G. Cappelletti, *op. cit.*, VI, p. 23, IX, p. 10 ff.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 152; P. Kehr, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 42. According to the anonymous chronicle of the fifteenth century, Marc. Cl. VII, Cod. 324, c. 18 (quoted by G. Saccardo, *L'antica chiesa*, p. 104), the first Cathedral of Rialto (from 774 to ca. 830) was the Ducal Chapel S. Teodoro.

century, it is claimed, belong SS. Sergio e Bacco and San Giacomo di Rialto, the latter dated 421 in Dandolo's Chronicle; to the sixth century are assigned S. Martino, S. Giovanni in Bragora, S. Salvatore, SS. Mena e Geminiano. Such claims must be largely discounted, but there can be no doubt that some of these churches and a few others were actually founded and built, perhaps as wooden structures, in the seventh or eighth centuries. In addition to the early churches mentioned above, these Venetian churches belong to the earliest period: S. Nicola dei Mendicoli, Sta Maria Formosa, S. Raffaello, S. Giustina, S. Zaccaria, and SS. Apostoli.³ The patrocinia of these and other early foundations can be divided into three main groups, according to their patron saints. One group, consisting of the apostles, and St. Peter in particular, points to Rome and Milan. A second group is related to Byzantium and features Greek martyrs like Nicholas, Theodore, Sergius and Bacchus, Menas; the Archangels, the prophets; Zechariah, St. John the Baptist and the Virgin. A third group which includes local saints like Hermagoras, Fortunatus, Cancius, Cancianus, Cancianilla, Euphemia, Dorothea, Thecla, and Erasma, testifies to the ecclesiastic links of the Venetian estuary with Aquileia and Grado. Some patrocinia of Frankish origin, such as Martin and Hilary, did not appear until the ninth century and were of importance only for a brief period.

The oldest of these patrocinia, those of St. Peter and the apostles, were imported from the mainland. St. Peter was the Patron Saint of three of the six bishoprics of the estuary, Heracleana, Caorle, and Castello-Rialto; dedications to the apostles can be traced back, on the mainland, to the late fourth century. The model of these dedications, which were connected with the possession of relics of the apostles, seems to have been St. Ambrose's Martyrium of the Apostles *ante portam Romanam* in Milan. This Milanese *basilica Sanctorum Apostolorum* was certainly the first apostles' church in Northern Italy.⁴ The idea, of course, goes back, in the last resort, to Constantine's and Constantius' foundation in Constantinople.

Although the name of the Milanese church, which possessed relics of Sts. John, Andrew, Thomas, and, perhaps, Luke was, owing to a translation of relics, altered in 396 to St. Nazarius, it continued to exert great influence. It can even be

³ The legend about the fire in the Realtine shipyard of Architon and the subsequent erection of S. Giacomo di Rialto in 428, contained in Dandolo's Chronicle had been refuted as early as 1785 (C. Tentori, *Saggio*, IV, p. 176) and was treated critically by G. Cappelletti, *op. cit.*, I, p. 36, and P. Kehr, *op. cit.*, p. 5. The question has been reopened in an uncritical manner by G. Marzemin, *Le origini*, p. 257 ff. For other early foundations of churches on the Realtine Islands, see: G. Cappelletti, *op. cit.*, p. 598 ff., and II, p. 397 ff.; F. Corner, *op. cit.*, *Ecclesiae Venetae*; R. Cattaneo, *L'architettura, passim*; G. B. Galliccioli, *Memorie Venete*, III, p. 14 ff. Hardly any of the foundation dates are, however, firmly established; they were deliberately pushed back by the Venetian tradition which tended to make all national institutions appear older than they actually were. On S. Zaccaria (829) see H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 424, with sources and bibliography.

⁴ The dedicatory inscription: *Condidit Ambrosius templum dominoque sacravit/ Nomine Apostolico munere reliquiis/ Forma crucis templum est templum victoria Christi/ Sacra triumphalis signat imago locum* in Cabrol, *Dictionnaire*, XI, s.v. "Milan," col. 1000; *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*, V, p. 617, note 3; V. Forcella, *Iscrizioni cristiane*, no. 229, and Mon. Germ. Hist., *Scriptores*, VIII, p. 40; on the importance of this foundation as a prototype, F. Lanzoni, *op. cit.*, p. 521; H. Delehaye, "Loca Sanctorum," p. 5 ff.; R. Egger, "Der heilige Hermagoras," p. 23 ff. On the Constantinopolitan prototype, see: A. Kaniuth, "Die Beisetzung," p. 6 ff., and H. Doerries, "Das Selbstzeugnis." On the Milanese church (the later S. Nazaro), see E. Villa, "La Basilica Apostolorum," and *infra*.

said to have started a fashion of apostles' churches in the North of Italy. The Milanese example was followed in the apostles' church of Concordia⁵ in the Venetian estuary, founded between 385 and 397. Certain passages of the sermon, preached, it seems, by the Bishop of Aquileia at its dedication, leave no doubt that the foundation was made at the instigation of St. Ambrose,⁶ who also donated to it the relics of St. John the Evangelist, St. John the Baptist, Sts. Andrew, Thomas, and Luke—parts of the same relics that were deposited in the Milanese church *ante portam Romanam* and had been acquired, apparently, as a gift which St. Ambrose received from Constantinople. The same dedicatory sermon stressed the fact that the church, though it possessed relics of only four apostles and the Baptist, was dedicated to all the apostles, since all the apostles were thought to be represented by the few present in the relics,⁷ as in the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, where Andrew, Luke, and Timothy also stood for the entire *corona*.

Between 388 and 397, at approximately the same time as at Concordia, an apostles' church was founded at Aquileia, with relics of Sts. John, Andrew, and Luke, and perhaps also of St. Thomas. Later this church was dedicated to St. Andrew, but a note in the *Martyrium Hieronymianum* and a fragment of an inscription testify to its original dedication to all the apostles.⁸ This dedication also goes back to St. Ambrose.⁹

Two more apostles' churches of Northern Italy can be traced back to the direct influence of St. Ambrose. The church of Lodi was dedicated *Apostolorum nomine* by Bishop Bassianus, who invited St. Ambrose to take part in the dedication,¹⁰ and the basilica *Concilium Sanctorum* of Brescia, founded on the suggestion of St. Ambrose, was dedicated *ca.* 400 with the already familiar Milanese relics of Sts. John, Thomas, Andrew, and Luke.¹¹ Northern Italy was not, however, the only region where the idea of St. Ambrose was adopted. The movement for building apostles' churches radiated from Milan to Campania, where we find the relics of Andrew, Thomas, Luke, and the Baptist, together

⁵ See the bibliography in the foregoing note and P. Paschini, "Note sull' origine . . . di Concordia," p. 9 ff.; P. L. Zovatto, "Antichi monumenti," p. 12 ff.

⁶ The text of the sermon was printed by P. Paschini, *op. cit.*, p. 12 ff., after the Florilegium Casinense (*Bibliotheca Casinensis*, II [Monte Cassino, 1910], p. 120). The significant words are *de munere sanctorum* in the sermon and *nomine apostolico munere*, etc. in the Milanese inscription.

⁷ . . . *data est portio ut et vos totum in portione haberetis . . . Unde ita credere et habere debemus quasi in paucis omnes.*

⁸ K. Lanckoroński, ed., *Der Dom*, p. 67; *La Basilica di Aquileia*, p. 280; R. Egger, *op. cit.*, p. 22 f., with restored text of the dedicatory inscription . . . *in honorem Sanctorum Apostolorum Parecorius Apollinaris consularis Venetiae et Histriae vir clarissimus fecit*. The apostle's church of St. Andrew which still existed as a parish church in the later Middle Ages seems to have been supplanted by the present baroque church of S. Antonio di Padova.

⁹ This is to be concluded from the Concordia sermon (see *supra*), from the identity of the relics of Milan, Concordia, and Aquileia, and from the close relationship between St. Ambrose and the Aquileian Bishops Valerianus and Chromatius. See: R. Egger, *op. cit.*, p. 20; P. Paschini, "Le vicende politiche . . . da Costantino a Carlo Magno," VII (1911), p. 177 ff., esp. p. 220; VIII (1912), pp. 49 ff., 152 ff., 233 ff.; IX (1913), p. 1 ff.; B. M. de Rubeis, *Dissertationes*, p. 183 ff.

¹⁰ See the letter of St. Ambrose (Epist. IV/1) in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XVI, p. 889: . . . *de basilicae, quam condidit Apostolorum nomine, dedicatione*. H. Delehaye, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

¹¹ The dedicatory sermon of Bishop Gaudentius in Migne, *PL*, XX, col. 959 ff.; H. Delehaye, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

with those of Milanese martyrs in the churches of Nola and Fondi,¹² and to France where St. Victrice of Rouen used exactly the same relics in the dedication of a *Basilica Apostolorum*.¹³

All these churches were dedicated during the last years of the fourth century or the first years of the fifth century, under the direct influence of St. Ambrose; but the movement did not die with the great Milanese organizer. Ravenna took it up, first with patrocinia of St. Andrew, St. John the Evangelist, and Sts. Peter and Paul, all dedicated after 425,¹⁴ and, one hundred and twenty-five years later, with the *ecclesia sancti Stephani*, dedicated in about 550 by Maximianus with relics of the Baptist, St. John the Evangelist, St. Andrew, St. Thomas, four more apostles, and numerous other saints.¹⁵ These Ravennate foundations throw light on the political and ecclesiastical meaning of the entire movement; their dates coincide with successive attempts, especially that of Justinian, to make Ravenna the political and ecclesiastical center of all Italy, attempts that were directed against Aquileia, Milan, and Rome itself.¹⁶ It seems that the possession of apostles' relics was held to be indispensable for the would-be metropolis of a national or state Church. The model was, of course, Constantinople, the successor of Rome. Later tradition even assigned to Constantinople an apostolic foundation through St. Andrew.^{16a} The model of Constantinople was copied by St. Ambrose in Milan in order to give to the favorite residence of the emperors and co-emperors of the West the fitting distinction of apostolic protection and even that of apostolic foundation, and it seems that Maximianus outdid St. Ambrose in assembling apostolic relics in order to lend force to his plans for overshadowing Milan.

III. THE RELICS OF ST. MARK

The church of St. Stephen in Ravenna was not the last apostles' church in Italy. The idea of St. Ambrose was revived in the first half of the ninth century by the Venetians. It is quite in keeping with their desire to create for themselves a practically independent state church, as well as with their policy vis-à-vis Aquileia, that they deposited in San Marco the relics of several apostles, in competition with Constantinople, Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna.

Thus, San Marco was from the beginning an apostles' church, with all the implications that the possession of apostles' relics held for the Italians of the early Middle Ages. Where the relics came from, and which of those that are now in the church or in the treasury were actually acquired in the ninth century, when the first church of San Marco was built, cannot be determined with certainty. Those which are kept in the Tesoro, the relics of Sts. Peter, Paul, An-

¹² H. Delehaye, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

¹⁴ P. Paschini, "Note sull' origine . . . di Concordia," p. 19.

¹⁵ H. Delehaye, *op. cit.*, p. 22; O. G. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress*, pp. 16, 130.

¹⁶ O. G. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress*, *passim*. This seems to me to have been proved by von Simson, though I do not subscribe to all of his opinions.

^{16a} See F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*.

drew, Matthew, James, Luke, Philip, Bartholomew, Judas, Thaddaeus, and Simon, may derive from the booty of 1204 or may even have been acquired after the fire of 1230/31, when many relics and all the early inventories were destroyed.¹⁷ They indicate, in any case, how much importance the Venetians attached to the possession of apostles' relics even in later times. Those relics, however, which are still in the altar of the Cappella San Pietro, to the left of the main presbytery of San Marco, seem to have been placed in the church at the time of its foundation. They belong to Sts. Peter, John the Evangelist, Matthew, Luke, and Bartholomew.¹⁸ As is apparent from this list, these relics were not taken from Concordia or from any of St. Ambrose's foundations; nor were they collected from other Realtine churches like San Giacomo di Rialto (there are no relics of St. James among those in the Cappella di San Pietro).¹⁹ They must have been acquired expressly for the purpose of surrounding the patron of the church, St. Mark, with an apostolic cortège and of making his "Martyrium" an apostles' church. How deeply the veneration of the apostles penetrated into Venetian thought and life in general may be gauged from the fact that, in later times, the twelve oldest families of Venice were called "apostolic."²⁰

The relics of St. Mark himself, the most highly prized possession not only of San Marco but of all Venice, appeared in Rialto in 828/9 and were reputed to have been brought there from Alexandria by two Venetian merchants, Tribunus and Rusticus, with the aid of two Greek monks, Stauracius and Theodore. The narrative of the *Translatio* begins with an ample introduction calculated to prove the divine right of the Venetians to the possession of the Apostle's relics. A part of this ^{DISCORSO}harangue is presented in the form of a dialogue, or rather, a tetralogue, between the Venetian merchants Tribunus and Rusticus, on the one side, and the Alexandrian monks Theodore and Stauracius, the custodians of the Martyrium of St. Mark, on the other. The two merchants have been driven off their course to Alexandria (thus excusing the normal trade with the infidel); having arrived there, they hear of the Khalif's plans to destroy the church in which the relics are kept; they consequently seek to persuade the custodians to hand the relics over to them. After a long-winded debate, which gives the author of the *Translatio* an opportunity for marshalling all his arguments, the custodians are persuaded to flee with the relics to Venice. They substitute the body of St. Claudia for that of St. Mark and succeed in carefully taking the latter out of its silken shroud. The "heathen," alarmed by the wonderful fragrance exhaled by the relics, suspect the theft but find the seals intact and an uncorrupted body within the cover. After the hue and cry has died down, the four conspirators put the relics in a basket and cover them with pork, which effectively repels the Moslem customs officers. After a miraculously quick

¹⁷ For the contents of the Tesoro see A. Pasini, *Il tesoro*; E. Molinier, *Le trésor*; G. Lorenzetti, *Venezia*, p. 218f. On the fire of 1230/31 and the booty of the Impresa see *infra*, pp. 17 ff.

¹⁸ G. Meschinello, *La chiesa*, p. 95; G. Cappelletti, *La basilica*, p. 111 ff.

¹⁹ It is not known at what time SS. Apostoli, another apostles' church of Venice, was founded, nor what relics of the apostles it possessed, if any. It is considered of ancient date and was rebuilt, in 1105, after a fire, according to *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 260.

²⁰ A. da Mosto, *I dogi*, p. 46.

crossing, the sleeping sailors are warned by St. Mark himself that they are nearing the coast. The first stop is made at Umago on the coast of Istria, where a sceptic upon becoming a believer ceases to be plagued by a demon. Fearful that the Doge may punish them for having infringed on the trade embargo with Egypt, the merchants send a messenger to Venice. After having been given a promise of immunity, they proceed to Venice-Olivolo, where Bishop Ursus and his clergy receive the relics and conduct them in solemn procession to the palace of Doge Justinian Partecipacius. While being carried to their temporary resting place near or in the palace, they become so heavy that they can hardly be lifted up. The Doge vows to erect a church for them, but dies before he can keep his promise, which is, after his death, fulfilled by his successor Johannes Partecipacius. Thus runs the narrative. It is irrelevant whether some, or all, particulars of the colorful story of the theft of the relics, their smuggling out of Moslem Alexandria, their journey and their translation to Venice are pious inventions; the fact is that the relics were believed to have come into the possession of the Venetians in 829.²¹

To determine just when the elaborate legend of the *Translatio* took shape is another question altogether.²² The oldest of the extant manuscript versions of the *Translatio* are of the eleventh century and for intrinsic reasons it must be assumed that the final redaction took place shortly after 1050.²³ There are, however, certain traits in the *Translatio* which make it certain that its author used earlier texts of the tenth, if not of the late ninth, century, and a nucleus must even go back to sources contemporary with the actual transfer of the relics.²⁴ This original nucleus probably contained very few of the miraculous

²¹ The legend and the facts about the *Translatio* of the relics of St. Mark are to be found in: *Acta Sanctorum*, April 3, *ad diem* XXV, p. 353 ff.; B. Justinianus, "De Divi Marci Evangelistae vita"; A. Molinus, *De vita*. The text of the *Acta Sanctorum* is now replaced by the critical edition of N. McCleary, "Note storiche," p. 238 ff. See further: L. Manin, *Memorie storico-critiche*, 1st ed., p. 12 ff.; 2nd ed., p. 6 ff.; A. F. Gfroerer, *Geschichte Venedigs*, p. 164 ff.; G. Guerzoni, "San Marco"; P. Molmenti, "Le leggende," in: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 8 ff.; R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, II, p. 305; G. Pavanello, "San Marco nella leggenda," p. 293 ff.; B. Cecchetti, "Di una creduta testa," p. 167 ff.

The earliest document referring to the possession of the relics is the testament of Doge Justinian Partecipacius († 829), extant in a copy of the fourteenth century (partial text in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 3, no. 20; complete text in R. Cessi, "Documenti," p. 93). The *Chronicon Venetum* (or *Altinate*; ed. H. Simonsfeld, in MGHs, XIV, p. 1 ff.), compiled in the tenth century and added to in the twelfth century, and the chronicle of the Venetian Johannes Diaconus (MGHS, VII, p. 4 ff., and G. Monticolo, "Cronache," p. 109) written in the beginning of the eleventh century, attest to the possession of the relics and give an account of the *Translatio*. So do most of the later Venetian chroniclers, including Andrea Dandolo (*Chronicon*, p. 169).

On the attitude of the Middle Ages to relics in general and on the practice of robbery, see: H. Fichtenau, "Zum Reliquienwesen," p. 60 ff.; E. Le Blant, *Le vol des reliques*; H. Silvestre, "Commerce et vol de reliques," p. 721 ff.; G. Guirand, "Le commerce de reliques," p. 73 ff.

²² N. McCleary, *op. cit.*, p. 223 ff.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 231 f. A passage in the *Translatio* seems to presuppose the edict of Leo IX, issued in 1050, on the celibacy of priests (*ibid.*, p. 249). On the other hand, the *Translatio* says nothing of the *Collocatio* of 1094 and must, therefore, have been written before that date.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 234: The text of the *Translatio* speaks of the church of San Marco as the building of the Partecipazi (ninth century) without mentioning the fire of the tenth century or the subsequent rebuilding by the Orseoli. The historical and topographical details of the *Translatio* concerning Venetia as well as Alexandria are astonishingly correct. The name of the islands sighted on the return journey, "Stroalia" (= Isole Strofadi or Stirvali), contains an echo of the *Aeneid*, bk. III, v. 204 ff.; in Dandolo's *Chronicle* (col. 171) it is altered to "Artalia."

traits of the final version. It was undoubtedly a fairly sober statement of the facts about the transfer of the relics from Alexandria in 829/9, an undertaking which must have been in itself rather hazardous.

What induced the Venetians to undergo these hazards and to choose St. Mark as the central figure of their *collegium apostolorum*? Why did they not group the other apostles round the greatest of them, St. Peter, an undertaking for which there was good precedent in the tradition of the Venetian province? A church of St. Peter already existed on one of the Realtine islands, namely San Pietro di Castello, the cathedral of the episcopate of Olivolo-Rialto. For reasons of ecclesiastical policy, however, this church could not be made the ducal chapel, the repository of apostles' relics and, hence the center of the Venetian State Church. Actually, it was, among other factors, the desire to counterbalance the power of the episcopate of Castello, largely dependent on Rome, that induced the Venetians to create a new ecclesiastical center. For this, they needed a new central figure. This central saint could be none other than St. Mark. As a disciple of St. Peter and as the author of a gospel that was considered to have been written in Rome under the guidance of St. Peter himself, for the use of the "Italians," St. Mark was regarded as a specifically Italian apostle. He was furthermore believed to have been the apostolic missionary of the Northern Adriatic and as such, the real founder of the patriarchate of Venetia.²⁵ The period in which this belief grew up and took shape is still a matter of dispute. The earliest Aquileian documents contain no allusion to an apostolic foundation; nor is there any mention of it in the writings of Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, Venantius Fortunatus, and Bede, all of whom deal with Aquileia and its saints. The earliest datable literary reference to St. Mark in connection with Aquileia and the Northern Adriatic in general is a passage in Paulus Diaconus' *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*, written between 783 and 786.²⁶ The veneration of St. Mark as the founder of the Aquileian church must, however, be considerably older than the second half of the eighth century. It must have been firmly established by the beginning of the seventh century, when the Emperor Heraclius (610-641) donated the "Alexandrian throne of St. Mark" to the cathedral of Grado. This well-documented imperial gift presupposes the recognition of the founding of the Adriatic patriarchate by the apostle.²⁷ The legend

²⁵ According to the twelfth-century *Chronicon Patriarcharum Aquileiensium*, printed in B. De Rubeis, *Monumenta*, app. VI, St. Mark was even believed to have written his gospel in Aquileia itself.

²⁶ Migne, *PL*, XCV, p. 699, and MGHS, II, p. 261: [Petrus] Marcum vero qui praecipuus inter eius discipulos habebatur, Aquileiam destinavit, quibus [populis] cum Hermagoram suum comitem Marcus praefecisset, ad beatum Petrum reversus ab eo nihilominus Alexandriam missus est.

²⁷ Heraclius' donation of the stone cathedra of St. Mark, now in the Tesoro of San Marco (see *infra*, note 53) is mentioned in most of the Venetian chronicles, beginning with Johannes Diaconus in the early eleventh century (ed. Monticolo, "Cronache," p. 62). An even earlier reference to it, and to another cathedra, that of St. Hermagoras, is to be found in the acts of the Synod of Mantua, 827 (the most recent publication in Mon. Germ. Hist., *Concilia*, II/2, p. 583 ff.; the passage [which may be a slightly later interpolation of the Acts, see R. Cessi, "Nova Aquileja," p. 543 ff.] is also printed in B. M. De Rubeis, *op. cit.*, p. 414 f.). The matter is complicated by the fact that there were two cathedrae: first, the stone cathedra of St. Mark, donated by Heraclius and now in the Tesoro of San Marco, and, second, an ivory and wood *cathedra Sancti Hermagorae*. They are both mentioned by Johannes Diaconus (ed. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 62), with the assertion that the ivory cathedra was sent to Patriarch Elias (572-586) by Heraclius (610-641), a chronological impossibility which does not seem to have bothered

of the foundation may be considerably older still, if Egger is right in ascribing to the *Passio Sanctorum Hermagorae episcopi et Fortunati diaconi* a date in the second half of the fifth century. St. Mark figures in the *Passio* as the teacher of St. Hermagoras and as the missionary founder of the Aquileian patriarchate.²⁸ Other authors refer the *Passio* to the ninth century;²⁹ but, whatever its true date may be, it is safe to assume that the belief in the foundation of the Venetian Church by St. Mark went back to early traditions and was firmly established in the beginning of the ninth century. The Venetians, consequently, regarded and called themselves *primogeniti filii eius*, the first-born sons of St. Mark, and found in this the justification for robbing Alexandria of the Saint's relics and transferring them to Venice.³⁰

When the relics reached Venice after a miraculous voyage, they were solemnly received and carried in procession to the Ducal Palace. It is attested that they were first deposited in a tower or chapel at the corner of the Palace by Doge Justinian Partecipacius (Parteciacus),³¹ who in his last will provided for the building of a church in honor of the Saint.³² The undertaking was carried out

Johannes; and by the *Chronicon Altinate* (ed. H. Simonfeld, MGHS, XIV, p. 49). The compiler of the *Passio S. Marci* (*Acta Sanctorum*, April 3, p. 347) has confused the ivory cathedra of St. Hermagoras with the stone cathedra of St. Mark by calling the former the *cathedra Sancti Marci*. The ivory cathedra was still seen in Grado more or less intact, about 1500, by G. Candido; in the seventeenth century, E. Palladio de Olivis saw only the wooden structure, stripped of its ivories. Even this structure has now disappeared (see N. McCleary, "Note storiche," p. 244f.). It is unlikely that this cathedra was the one, now also lost, of which the plaques are preserved in Milan, Paris, and London; see H. Graeven, "Der Heilige Markus," p. 109ff.; A. Ottino della Chiesa, "Gli avori," p. 253ff., esp. p. 258f.; M. H. Longhurst, *Carvings*, I, p. 32f.; W. F. Volbach, "Gli avori," p. 134ff.; G. Belloni, "Gli avori," all with bibliography. Volbach and others date these ivories (on which a monograph by Belloni is in preparation) in the eleventh century and ascribe them to southern Italy, where they may have been copied from Alexandrian originals.

Further, the ivory cathedra of Aquileia-Grado had nothing to do with the two (?) ivory thrones which Peter II Orseolo sent to Otto III in Ravenna (*eburneum sedile cum suo subsellio*, and *cathedra elephantinis artificiose sculpta tabulis*), according to Johannes Diaconus (ed. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 164). On the question of the ivory cathedra see also C. Cecchelli, *La cattedra*, I, p. 39ff.

There is yet another cathedra of marble, the reputed throne of St. Peter in S. Pietro di Castello, fashioned out of an Arab tombstone, which is often confused with the *cathedra Sancti Marci*. See: C. De Magistris, "Cattedra arabica"; F. Stefani, "La cattedra arabica." *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 67f.; F. Corner, *Ecclesiae Venetae*, XIII, pp. 191-196. This cathedra was also an imperial gift according to Venetian tradition (Marino Sanudo, *Le vite dei dogi*, ed. G. Monticolo, p. 115; fifteenth century). The Byzantine Emperor Michael III (842-867) is said to have donated it to the Venetians in recognition of their services in the naval expedition against the Saracens. However, the Arab tombstone, of which it is made, seems to be later than the ninth century. The legend of the donation of the cathedra to St. Peter by Theophilus of Antioch is found in the *Legenda Aurea* of Jacobus de Voragine (ed. Th. Graesse), p. 178ff.

²⁸ R. Egger, "Hermagoras," p. 32ff; the *Passio* is printed *ibid.*, p. 40ff.; P. Paschini, "Le fasi," p. 161ff.

²⁹ Thus P. Paschini, "Sulle origini di Aquileia," p. 124.

³⁰ *Translatio Sancti Marci* in N. McCleary, *op. cit.*, p. 253. The words: *ergo nos sumus primogeniti filii eius* are used by the two Venetian robber merchants Tribunus and Rusticus in their highly instructive argument with the two Alexandrian custodians of the relics. With a certain candid naiveté, the *Passio* relates that the Greek custodians were finally persuaded to yield the body, not by the arguments of the Venetians but by the rumor that one of their colleagues had been cruelly flogged by the "heathen King." There is a trace of bad conscience in this admission.

³¹ Chronicle of Johannes Diaconus, ed. G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 110. See also the documents in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 3, no. 21 etc.; according to later documents (*ibid.*, p. 2, no. 9), the relics were first deposited in the chapel of St. Theodore.

³² For the testament of Justinian Partecipacius see *supra*, note 21; also, *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 172, and later Venetian chronicles, in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 1, no. 3, p. 2, no. 16; H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, p. 424.

by Justinian's brother and successor Johannes,³³ and the relics are said to have been placed in the completed church in 836.³⁴

This church, the first shrine of the Saint's relics,³⁵ was burned in the rebellion against Doge Petrus Candianus IV in 976,³⁶ and reconstructed by Doges Pietro Orseolo I and II, Vitale Candiano, and Tribuno Menio towards the close of the tenth century.³⁷ This second building, which seems to have been a replica of the first, was pulled down, at least in part, and rebuilt from 1063 onwards, under Doges Domenico Contarini, Domenico Selvo, and Vitale Falier.³⁸ When the new church was about to be consecrated in 1084/5 or 1093/4,³⁹ the precious relics, the palladium and the glory of Venice, suddenly appeared to have been lost, according to later sources. This loss is somewhat difficult to explain in view of the extreme importance that was attached to the relics from the very beginning. The Venetian chroniclers, however, explain it by pointing out that the hiding-place of the relics was always known to two persons only, namely, the Doge himself and the Primicerius, the highest ecclesiastic of the church, and that the continuity of the secret's transmission may have been interrupted by the troubles at the end of Selvo's reign (1084). They refer also to the building activities in the church itself as an additional cause of the temporary loss of the relics. The entire story is, however, part of a legend, the historical nucleus of which is, as far as can be made out, the deposition of the relics in the crypt of the completed church on October 8, 1094.⁴⁰ Popular imagination and official Venetian historiography, always ready to create myths that could serve to enhance the glory of St. Mark and his people, seem to have turned this *collocatio* into an *inventio* or, rather, a miraculous *apparitio*, thus improving on the simple placing of apostles' relics in the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. According to the legend, the lost relics reappeared after three days of fasting and prayer in which the entire *Commune Veneciarum*, with the doge and the clergy, took part. A pillar or column of the building opened miracu-

³³ On the building of the first church, see: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 109ff., and *ibid.*, *Documenti*, p. 1, nos. 5, 7; p. 2, nos. 13, 14; p. 3, nos. 17, 19, 21; Johannes Diaconus, ed. G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 109; *Translatio Sancti Marci, Acta Sanctorum*, April 3, p. 353f.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 429f.

³⁴ According to Johannes Diaconus, ed. G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

³⁵ The church of the Partecipaci was not, however, the first ecclesiastical building dedicated to St. Mark in the Venetian estuary. There was (according to the *Chronicon Gradense*, ed. G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 112) a chapel of St. Mark in Amiana, near Torcello, said to have been founded by the tribunes Aurius and Maurus, two semilegendary figures; another, now supplanted by a baroque edifice, existed in Aquileia, near the suburb Muretana, or Mursiana (K. Lanckoroński, *Der Dom*, p. 68); and a third was in Grado, built about 815 (Johannes Diaconus, ed. G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 105; K. Lanckoroński, *op. cit.*, p. 77).

³⁶ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 115; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 132ff.; *ibid.*, *Documenti*, p. 4, nos. 27-37, p. 5, nos. 40, 43.

³⁷ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, pp. 116, 120; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 132ff.; *ibid.*, *Documenti*, p. 4, no. 36; p. 5, nos. 39, 41, 42, 44, 46.

³⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 153ff.; *ibid.*, *Documenti*, p. 5f., nos. 47-57, p. 209f., nos. 811-814; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 453f.; L. Marangoni, "L'architetto"; S. Bettini, *L'architettura di San Marco, passim*. See also *infra*, p. 70ff.

³⁹ The consecration date of 1085 is given in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 8, no. 64 (Chronicle Scivos); the later date, 1093, *ibid.*, p. 8, no. 65 (Chronicle Zorzi Dolfin); an even later date, between 1102 and 1117, is mentioned, *ibid.*, p. 8, no. 74 (Chronicle Bemba). Cf. A. Pasini, "Quale sia il vero anno."

⁴⁰ This date is given in an inscription found in 1811 on the leaden casket containing the relics: *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti, facsimili*, pl. II, no. 3. See also L. Manin, *Memorie storico-critiche*, 2nd ed., p. 47ff.

lously, showing the sarcophagus of the Saint and, in later versions, even his uncorrupted body or beckoning hand.⁴¹ To underline the solemn character of the occasion, the miraculous *apparitio* was combined in the legend with a subsequent visit to the church by the German Emperor Henry IV, who came to pay his respects to the newly placed relics.⁴²

The legend of the *apparitio* can be traced back no further than the thirteenth century. Neither the earliest (almost contemporary) source of the *collocatio*, the *Translatio Sci Nicolai*, written soon after 1100 by a monk of San Nicolo di Lido,⁴³ nor the writers of the twelfth century know anything of the miracle. It appears in the thirteenth century, when, according to the *Chronique des*

⁴¹ The legend of the *apparitio* is narrated by Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Th. Graesse, 3rd ed., p. 268 ff.; Petrus Calo of Chioggia, *Legendae de Tempore et de Sanctis*; the relevant passage printed in: *Acta Sanctorum*, April 3, p. 356 f.; and *Andreae Danduli Chronicon* ed. Muratori, col. 252 f. An even fuller version, replete with miracles wrought by the rediscovered relics, is contained in three codices of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (Cod. Marc. Zanetti lat. 356; Cod. Correr I, 416; Cod. Correr Cicogna 2987-2988) and in a later redaction, composed with the purpose of exalting the Dolfin family, in the sixteenth-century Cod. Marc. Lat. X, 140. The full texts of these versions were published with a critical commentary by G. Monticolo, *L'apparitio*, p. 111 ff., esp. p. 137 ff. Monticolo is, I believe, mistaken in stating that a nucleus of the manuscript versions studied by him goes back to a time before the thirteenth century, since the tone and style of the narrative are homogeneous and betray the hand of a Dominican monk of the late thirteenth century: the episode of Giuliano da Faenza, which contains the date 1261, is of a piece with the rest and presupposes a date after that year. Thus, the full narrative versions of the *apparitio* are late Dominican fabrications. Monticolo partly retracted his thesis in his subsequent *Nota intorno all'Apparitio*, pp. 475-482.

The other early sources alluding to the miraculous *apparitio* are also of the thirteenth century. A spurious source, allegedly of the eleventh century, quoted by Bernardus Justinianus (Giustinian), *De origine* (see G. Monticolo, *L'apparitio*, p. 123 f., and: *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 232 ff.) is nothing but an embellishment of the *Translatio Sancti Nicolai* (see *infra*) which says nothing of the *apparitio*, but speaks of a *sublevatio reliquiarum* and a *collocatio*. Mention of the festival of the *apparitio* (June 25) in a Venetian Calendarium of the eleventh century is admittedly an insertion by a late, perhaps thirteenth- or even fourteenth-century, hand: G. B. Gallicciolli, *Memorie venete*, III, p. 82. Far from proving the early establishment of the festival, the Calendarium with its later insertion is even a fairly conclusive proof against it. There is in the Calendarium a separate festival (January 30) dedicated to the *Inventio corporis beati Marci*; the later addition of the festival of the *apparitio* refers to June 25. This latter festival was not included in Venetian calendars until the second half of the thirteenth century. (*Capitularia artium*, see G. Monticolo, *Apparitio*, p. 111).

The earliest chronicles mentioning the *apparitio* are the thirteenth-century *Annales Venetici Breves* (ed. H. Simonsfeld in MGHS, XIV, p. 70; *idem*, in *Neues Archiv für Altere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, I, p. 402 f.) and the thirteenth-century Chronicle of Martino da Canale, (ed. A. Rossi, p. 526 f.); in the fourteenth century it is referred to in *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 251, and in an anonymous chronicle, the relevant passage of which is printed in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 7, no. 63; see also several fifteenth- and sixteenth-century chronicles (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 7, no. 61; p. 6 f. nos. 60, 62; p. 210, no. 815; p. 5, no. 48).

For further references to this subject, which requires a new treatment, see: F. Corner, *op. cit.*, X, p. 67; A. Cicogna, *Sullo scoprimento*; L. Manin, *op. cit.*, 2nd ed., p. 11 ff.; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 10 f. (Molmenti); C. Neumann, "Die Markuskirche," p. 621 f.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 447; G. Pavanello, "San Marco nella leggenda." On the traditional location of the *apparitio* (southeast pillar of the central square) cf. R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 156 f.

The *inventio* (not the *apparitio*) may have been real; but even this *inventio* followed a famous prototype, namely, the finding or, rather, the uncovering, of the relics of Sts. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy during the rebuilding of the Apostoleion at Constantinople under Justinian (Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, Bonn ed., III, p. 189 f., and *Acta Sanctorum*, Oct. 8, p. 301). The Venetians improved on their model. What was a simple uncovering and collocation in Constantinople, became in San Marco an *inventio* and even a miraculous *apparitio*.

⁴² *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, p. 251.

⁴³ Monachi Anonymi Littorensis, *Historia de translatione*, in *Recueil des historiens des Croisades*, V, p. 253 ff. The author was a monk of S. Nicolò al Lido, whose sober report on the collocation (*sublevatio*) of the relics of St. Mark was also followed by the Annali of Magno (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 210, no. 816).

Venetians of Martino da Canale, Doge Ranieri Zeno (1253-1268) "renewed" the festival in commemoration of the miraculous apparition.⁴⁴ As there is no mention of this festival before Ranieri Zeno, and as this Doge is known to have ardently furthered faith in ancient miracles,⁴⁵ it is possible that the festival of the *apparitio* was not "renewed" but newly created about the middle of the thirteenth century and that the formation of the entire legend had taken place only a short time before this, at the instigation of the Dominican friars. This comparatively late date for the legend is further supported by the date of its earliest pictorial representation. The legend certainly grew out of the new and proud nationalism of the Venetians of the thirteenth century, a nationalism that led to a rewriting of Venetian history as the story of a chosen people. Its growth may have been fostered by the secrecy in which the hiding place of the relics was shrouded, a secrecy that was necessary in a time of pious thefts and robberies. Another reason why the Venetians may have wished to reassert their possession of the relics through the story of a miraculous apparition may have been the repeated, if unsuccessful, claims of the monks of Reichenau to possess the true remains of St. Mark which they pretended to have "acquired" in 830 in Venice itself.⁴⁶

The legend of the *apparitio* was not the only one of this kind to have originated in the thirteenth century, that most prolific period of state-controlled mythogenesis. It was at the same time, in the middle of the Ducento, that the motif of the *praedestinatio* or *vaticinatio* was added to the legend of the Saint. The new motif concerns the alleged visionary announcement made to St. Mark on his return journey from Aquileia, that his bones would eventually be laid to rest in the island of Rialto, indeed in the exact location of San Marco. This is an attempt to establish, so to speak, a prehistory of the relics and, with it, the Venetians' divine right to their possession, as well as the predestined location of the church of San Marco. As far as can be determined, the *vaticinatio* first appears in literary form in a hymn in honor of St. Mark composed by Martino da Canale and contained in his chronicle written between 1267 and 1275. At about the same time, perhaps even a few years earlier, the newly invented theme found its first pictorial representations in the vault mosaics of the present Cappella Zeno in San Marco⁴⁷ and in a curious marble group, now crowning the central

⁴⁴ Martino da Canale, ed. Rossi, p. 526f.

⁴⁵ As shown by his successful campaign for the papal recognition of the miraculous salvation of relics in the Tesoro fire of 1231; his letter to the Pope in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 211f. no. 828.

⁴⁶ Reichenau claimed that the relics of St. Valentine, the possession of which is attested by early Reichenau annals, were in reality those of St. Mark. See: Sigebertus, *Chronica*, in MGHS, VI, p. 311; *ibid.*, IV, p. 450. The question has been dealt with by L. Manin, *Memorie*, 2nd ed., p. 17; and C. Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 622. A similar version of the Reichenau legend in the *Chronicon Augiense* of Herimannus Contractus, *sub anno* 830. See J. v. Schlosser, *Schriftquellen*, no. 477, p. 148.

⁴⁷ On the *praedestinatio* or *vaticinatio* see G. Pavanello, *op. cit.*, p. 310ff.; bibliography on p. 323, note 31. L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, p. 72. The hymn of Martino da Canale in his *Chronique des Venetiens*, ed. A. Rossi, p. 670; the fourteenth-century chronicle of Andrea Dandolo, col. 14, contains a fuller version of the legend. The inscription of the Cappella Zeno mosaic (see *infra*) is more succinct: *Cum transitum faceret per mare ubi nunc posita est ecclesia Sci Marci Angelus ei nunciavit quod post aliquantum tempus a morte ipsius corpus eius hic honorifice locaretur*. The origin of the *praedestinatio* legend might, perhaps, be traced back to the thirteenth-century legend of San Francesco del Deserto in the Venetian lagoons. Jacopo Michiel gave this island to the Franciscan Friars in 1238, basing the donation on the tradition that St. Francis had rested on this island after having stilled a tempest there on his return from the East.

door of the church façade. This group, the so-called *Sogno di San Marco*, now serves as the frontispiece, as it were, to the text provided by the iconographical decoration of the church; it represents a sleeping, bearded figure in a recumbent position and, behind it, an angel whose gestures indicate speech. The group, which for stylistic reasons must be dated about the middle of the thirteenth century, is, by popular tradition, interpreted as a representation of the vision of St. Mark, the *vaticinatio*, and this was certainly the intended meaning of the group from the time of its placement in San Marco. However, Gabelentz and Toesca are perhaps right in pointing out that the sculpture may have been meant originally as the Apparition of the Angel to the sleeping Joseph, an illustration of the scene preceding the Journey to Bethlehem or the Flight to Egypt. In any case, the iconographic scheme of this group is exactly that of Joseph's Dream. Thus the group may at first have been intended to form part of a christological cycle and later, when it was placed in the entrance hall (the present Zeno chapel), reinterpreted as the Vision of St. Mark. Had the theme existed for some time, a specific iconographic type would have been developed for its representation; as it was, a type invented for another theme could be, and even had to be borrowed.⁴⁸ Thus, all the available evidence goes to show that the legend of the *praedestinatio* or *vaticinatio* was invented in or after the middle of the thirteenth century, at the same time as the ceremony of the "Sposalizio del mar," with which the Venetian State extended its authority over the lagoons and over the seas, was introduced.⁴⁹

XIII

The fourteenth century added to these Marcian legends only minor details, like that of the Saint's ring, which occurs in various versions. Thus, several periods can be discerned in the history of the cult of St. Mark and his relics. The earliest lasted from the fifth or sixth century to the beginning of the ninth century. During this period the legend of apostolic foundation and the cult of the Saint took root in Aquileia-Grado, in imitation of similar trends in Milan, Ravenna, Verona, and Padua. The second period began with the transfer of the relics to Venice in 828/9, and is characterized by the interest which the Venetians took in the relics for reasons of ecclesiastic and state policy. This lasted until the end of the twelfth century. The third period began with the taking of Constantinople in 1204 and saw the rise of St. Mark to a position almost equivalent to that of the head of the Venetian State, accompanied by an increasing number of legends. By 1300 the main epoch of Venetian mythogenesis was over.

3 fasi della
leggende marciana

⁴⁸ On the *Sogno di San Marco* see A. Venturi, "Lo scultore," p. 247 f.; *idem.*, *Storia*, III, p. 347. Venturi accepts the usual interpretation as the vision of St. Mark; H. v. d. Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 198, P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, 2, pp. 794 (fig. 520), 896, and R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 288, consider it to be the Dream of Joseph. The Procession Panel of Gentile Bellini of 1496, shows in the niche of the central door not the *Sogno* but a gilt statue of the Virgin. At what period the Virgin was supplanted by the *Sogno* cannot be determined; it has, however, been suggested, that the *Sogno* stood for some time in the former entrance hall, the present Cappella Zeno (P. Paoletti, *Nuovi ritocchi*, p. 33), and was moved thence to its present location on the façade at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when the entrance hall was remodelled to serve as the sepulchre of Cardinal Zeno. At some time in the nineteenth century, the *Sogno* was removed to the Museo della Basilica and a cast substituted for it in the niche above the central door. In 1923, however, the cast was replaced again by the original.

⁴⁹ R. Jaeger, "Der Ring"; H. Simonsfeld, "Historisch-Diplomatische Forschungen."

Reliquie

To the orbit of the Patron Saint belonged also the relics of his disciples. Of these, the church had an almost complete collection. In the twelfth century, San Marco acquired the relics of Anianus, whom St. Mark had miraculously healed and consecrated bishop of Alexandria, thus making him the first of the Alexandrian patriarchs;⁵⁰ relics of the Aquileian disciples of St. Mark, Sts. Hermagoras and Fortunatus, were in the possession of the church by 1125, and probably had been since very early times.⁵¹ The same is true of the relics of the "Aquileian Virgins."⁵² But even more important were secondary Marcian relics, such as the cathedra, the Gospel Book, and the ring of the Evangelist. The cathedra Sancti Marci, now in the Tesoro of San Marco, was until *ca.* 1540 in the main apse, and from that time until 1830 in the Baptistery. This marble "throne" could never have served as a seat because of its small dimensions, and was, therefore, probably a kind of *ostensorium* for exposing relics or merely a reliquary in the shape of a throne. According to an old and well-attested tradition, the so-called cathedra was given to Bishop Primigenius of Grado in 628 by the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius. If this tradition is sound, and there is no reason for doubting it, the cathedra was the oldest Marcian relic in the Venetian estuary; its gift by Heraclius may imply that the Emperor favored Grado over Aquileia, and it constitutes the earliest and, perhaps, most significant act of recognition of the apostolic foundation of the Venetian patriarchate. It was only to be expected that the Venetians would, sooner or later, acquire this important relic and historic testimonial for their San Marco.⁵³ The alleged autograph Gospel Book of the Evangelist is divided between Cividale, Prague, and Venice; before that division it was kept in Aquileia.⁵⁴ Its acquisition for the treasure of the church was preceded by that of St. Mark's ring, which has been in the Tesoro of San Marco since the fourteenth century at least.⁵⁵

The eagerness with which relics of St. Mark, of his followers, and of the apostles were assembled in the church and the treasury of San Marco stands in marked contrast to the comparatively lukewarm attitude which the governing body of the church showed, at least in the early period, towards relics of other saints. The altar of St. Clement in the southern side chapel contains, according

⁵⁰ According to *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 21, the relics were acquired under Doge Pietro Polani (1130-1148).

⁵¹ They are enumerated, with others, in the *Translatio S. Isidori, Recueil des historiens des Croisades*, V, p. 321 ff. written by Cerbano Cerbani, a cleric of San Marco, in or soon after 1125.

⁵² Euphemia, Dorothea, Thecla, Erasma. They are mentioned in a manuscript description of the crypt, written in 1308 by Donadio, parish priest of San Luca. See *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 238.

⁵³ On the cathedra Sancti Marci in the Tesoro, see *supra*, note 27, and L. Fantoni, *La cathedra; La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 67 f.; A. Pasini, *Il tesoro*, p. 105 ff.; R. Egger, "Hermagoras," p. 234, and recently, A. Grabar, "La 'sedia'," p. 19 ff., and P. L. Zovatto, "La cattedra," p. 41 ff., with bibliography. O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und Byzantische Kunst*, I, p. 146, believes the cathedra to be of Coptic workmanship, fourth or fifth century; the style, however, points to a somewhat later date. R. Cattaneo, *Architecture*, p. 83 f. has proposed the seventh century, and Grabar the sixth or a somewhat later date. Professor Grabar's interpretation of the throne as a reliquary is convincing.

⁵⁴ The Prague leaves of the manuscript were acquired as a gift in 1354. The part now in San Marco was transferred there in 1420, by way of Murano (F. Corner, *op. cit.*, X, p. 176 ff.). For this part see: G. Cappelletti, *Storia della chiesa*, III, p. 373 ff.; A. Pasini, *op. cit.*, p. 81 ff.; G. Pavanello, *op. cit.*, p. 320. For the remainder, in Cividale, see: V. Joppi, "Le sacre reliquie," p. 208 ff.; C. L. Bethmann, "Die Evangelienhandschrift," p. 112; A. Zorzi and G. Mazzatinti, *Inventari*, p. 5 f.

⁵⁵ G. Cappelletti, *op. cit.*, III, p. 372; G. Pavanello, *op. cit.*, p. 320.

to an eleventh-century inscription, relics of Sts. Hermagoras, Fortunatus, Cornelius, Cyprianus, Hippolytus, and Cyrillus (all Aquileian Saints) and of Sts. Stephen, Clement, Blasius, Sergius, and Bacchus, which may all belong to the original stock, and perhaps even date back to the period prior to the foundation of San Marco. Not much, however, was added later.⁵⁶ It is, for instance, remarkable that no attempt was made to secure for the ducal church the celebrated relics of St. Nicholas, one of the most popular state patrons of seafaring Venice. They were, instead, placed in San Nicolo di Lido immediately after their acquisition, by robbery from Myra, in 1100.⁵⁷ The equally famous relics of the proto-martyr St. Stephen, acquired in Constantinople at the beginning of the twelfth century, were handed over to S. Giorgio Maggiore.⁵⁸ Not much was made of the relics of St. Isidore, taken from Chios in 1125; it is even likely that they were kept hidden and were found again only under Andrea Dandolo (1343-1354), when they were exposed to public veneration in the newly built Cappella di S. Isidoro in San Marco.⁵⁹ In the thirteenth century other churches received numerous relics from the Venetian booty of Constantinople,⁶⁰ while San Marco took comparatively few, and not so much relics of saints⁶¹ as reliquaries, which seem to have been deposited in the treasury for their material rather than their religious value.⁶² San Marco did secure from the booty of the Impresa drops of the Sacred Blood of Christ, splinters of the True Cross, a fragment of the Crown of Thorns, and a piece of the Column of the Flagellation. But neither the procuratori of San Marco nor the Venetians in general seem to have been willing to make financial sacrifices even for the greatest of such relics.

⁵⁶ On the relics in San Marco see: G. Tiepolo, *Trattato delle Santissime reliquie*; A. Morosini, *De sacris lpsanis*; F. Sansovino, *Venetia*. The relevant passage is reprinted in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 269f. (inventory of relics found in the altar of St. Leonard, 1617). Inventories of the Tesoro of 1283, preserved only in part, of 1325, and of 1519 are reprinted in A. Pasini, *Tesoro*, app. I, after p. 154. At the time the inventories were made many of these relics showed traces of the fire of 1231 (*combustae, fractae, affumatae*).

⁵⁷ See the *Translatio Sancti Nicolai*, in *Recueil des historiens des Croisades*, V, p. 253ff.

⁵⁸ *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 262f.; for the inventory of the relics of S. Giorgio (1362), see P. Molmenti, *La storia di Venezia*, 4th ed., I, p. 442.

⁵⁹ *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 272; *Translatio Sancti Isidori*, *Recueil des historiens des Croisades*, V, p. 321. P. Saccardo, *La cappella di S. Isidoro*.

⁶⁰ For this and the following, see: P. E. D. Riant, *Des dépouilles religieuses*, p. 1ff.; *idem.*, *Exuviae sacrae* (after Petrus Calò) I, p. 179ff., II, p. 261ff., III (ed. F. De Mély), esp. pp. 169ff., 274ff.; R. Janin, "Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine," II, p. 144ff. Following is a short list of the most important relics from the booty of 1204 in Venetian churches other than San Marco: St. Barbara (Sta Barbara, 1258); St. John of Alexandria (S. Daniele, 1215); St. Lucia (S. Giorgio Maggiore, 1205); St. Paul the Martyr (S. Giorgio Maggiore, 1222); St. Paul Hermit (S. Giuliano, 1240); St. Paul of Constantinople (S. Lorenzo, 1226); St. Helena (Sta Maria del Carmine, 1208); Sts. Saturninus, Nicodemus Presbyter, and Romanus (Sta Maria Formosa); St. Marina (Sta Marina, 1230); Sts. Eutychius and Nicetas (S. Raffaele, 1246 and after 1204); St. Theodore of Mesembria (S. Salvatore, 1267); Sts. Simeon and Hermolaus (S. Simeone Grande, 1204/5); St. Anastasius (S. Trinita, 1204); St. Agatha (S. Ubaldo, after 1204); Sts. Gregory and Theodore (S. Zaccaria, after 1204).

⁶¹ The most important relics of saints, acquired for San Marco after the Impresa, were: an arm of St. George (1204), a piece of the skull of St. John the Baptist (1204), an arm of St. Pantaleon (1204/5). On these and other relics looted from Constantinople, see the foregoing note and J. Ebersolt, *Constantinople*, p. 112ff.

⁶² A. Pasini, *Il tesoro*; E. Molinier, *Le trésor*; G. Lorenzetti, *Venezia*, p. 218f.; J. Ebersolt, *op. cit.*, p. 115ff. The Tesoro of San Marco suffered great damage from the fire of 1230/31 (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, nos. 93, 97, p. 211, no. 828) and by the spoliation of 1819 (N. Wiseman, *Brano*); see also *supra*, note 56.

They permitted the Crown of Thorns, which in 1238 had been given to the Venetian banker Vincenzo Querini as surety by the Latin Emperor Baldwin II and which was, for some time, actually exhibited in San Marco, to be bought in the following year by King Louis. They were equally disinterested in acquiring the Holy Lance and additional relics of the True Cross which were also bought by King Louis to be placed, together with the Crown of Thorns, in the Ste-Chapelle of Paris erected to serve as their shrine.⁶³

Numerous relics in the possession of San Marco perished in a fire that consumed the Tesoro of the church and the archives of the Ducal Palace in 1230/31.⁶⁴ About a generation later, at the instigation of the Dominican friars, the fact or the belief that some relics, namely, the reliquary containing a part of the True Cross, the ampulla with the Sacred Blood of Christ, the cranium of the Baptist, and others, were saved from the fire or found intact afterwards, was hailed as a miracle and became an officially recognized national legend. The story, whose development recalls that of the *apparitio*, was commemorated by a mosaic above the door of the present Tesoro and a relief in the corridor leading from the church to the Ducal Palace. In 1265, Doge Ranieri Zeno, convinced *per fratres praedicatores* that the salvation of the relics was nothing short of a miracle, sent a deputation of Dominican and Minor friars to the papal curia with testimonials and a circumstantial report of the salvation of the relics, in order to receive the papal acknowledgment of this miracle. At the same time he ordered his ambassadors at the papal curia to do everything in their power to further the quest of the deputation.⁶⁵

It is important to note that these endeavors originated not with the clergy of San Marco or even with the Doge, but with the Dominican order, and that it was no less than thirty-four years after the event that steps were taken to have the miracle acknowledged, and thereby the authenticity of the relics themselves. The attitude of the Venetians towards these and other relics must not, however, be interpreted as religious indifference—in spite of the later saying: “siamo Veneziani, poi Cristiani.” It had a deeper meaning: nothing, not even the most sacred relics, was allowed to overshadow the real palladium of Venice, the relics of St. Mark the Evangelist. The supreme importance that was attached to the latter rested, undoubtedly, on pious grounds, but there were also other reasons for this almost exclusive cult, reasons which are not far to seek. The possession of the relics was indeed one of the great political assets of ascendant Venice, an important factor in its political and ecclesiastic history. The Venetians used the cult of their Patron Saint as a most effective weapon in the struggle for political and ecclesiastic freedom, a struggle that had to be fought against Byzantium, Rome, Aquileia, and finally, against the Venetian patriarchate of Grado itself. It would be tempting to write a history of Venice in the

⁶³ J. Morand, *Histoire*; A. Gosselin, *Notice historique*; H. Stein, *Le palais*; V. Mortet and P. Deschamps, *Recueil des textes*, II, p. 241; L. Le Rouzic, *Le trésor*, p. 63ff. King Louis received only part of the relics; the rest remained in Constantinople.

⁶⁴ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, nos. 91–94, p. 211, nos. 824, 825.

⁶⁵ The letter of Ranieri Zeno is preserved in two slightly different copies: *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, no. 97 and p. 211, no. 828.

early Middle Ages from the point of view of the relics of St. Mark alone, and some authors have virtually done so.⁶⁶ It would be wrong, however, to credit the Venetians of the ninth century who brought the relics of the Evangelist to Venice with an insight into all the implications of their ingenious move, and to ascribe to them a fully developed plan for the future. But they and their successors at the helm of Venetian politics knew exactly what the possession of the relics was worth at any given moment of their city's struggle for independence and power, and they did not scruple to make use of this possession to its full value. As their aims were always the same, their actions and achievements seem to us, in historical perspective, to form a consistent pattern presupposing conscious planning, while all that can be stated is that they always strove for freedom and, to guarantee freedom, for power.

IV. ST. MARK AND ST. THEODORE: VENICE AND BYZANTIUM

The prehistory which the Venetians worked out for themselves had an even earlier chapter than that opened up by the *vaticinatio*. Patriotic imagination reached back even beyond Roman times to a period of migrations in which eastern tribes, the Veneti, settled in the northeastern regions of Italy. Actually, of course, the earliest history of Venice or rather Venetia proper begins much later.⁶⁷ It is the story of the settlement, of the concentration of power in Rialto, and of the gradual secession from Byzantium.⁶⁸ The settlements in the lagoons began as a Byzantine province. There the sovereignty of the Eastern Empire was an effective protection against the pressure of the Longobards and the Franks, while the towns of the mainland (Altinum, Padua, and Oderzo) succumbed to the continental powers in 636-640. The bishops of these towns fled to Torcello, Malamocco, and Heracliana, transferring thither their bishoprics. What Venetia lost thereby in territorial extent, it gained in security and concentration. Towards the end of the seventh century the new Venetia of the lagoons was administratively separated from Istria and organized as a special military province of the Greek Empire, a *ducatus* under the supreme command of the exarch of Ravenna, a step which marks the beginning of the dogate. Its first center was Heracliana. In the beginning, the *duces* had to contend with the resistance of the hereditary *tribuni* of the single towns, a process of

⁶⁶ A. F. Gfroerer, *Geschichte Venedigs*, p. 164ff., and C. Neumann, "Die Markuskirche," p. 613, who subjects Gfroerer's theories to severe criticism. On the veneration of St. Mark in later periods see H. C. Peyer, "Stadt und Stadtpatron," p. 22f.

⁶⁷ The most recent treatment of the early history of Venice is contained in volume one of the *Storia di Venezia*, and in R. Cessi's *Storia della Repubblica*. H. Kretschmayr's *Geschichte* retains, however, its value as one of the most dependable compendia. Still useful is S. Romanin's, *Storia*. The earliest history is succinctly treated by J. v. Schlosser, "Zwei Kapitel"; F. C. Hodgson, *The Early History*; C. Cipolla, "Ricerche sulle tradizioni"; G. Monticolo, "La cronaca di Giovanni Diacono e la storia."

The hypothesis of the Roman origin of Venice-Rialto, propounded by G. Marzemin (*Le origini romane*; "Le origini di Venezia," and other works by the same author) has not been accepted by other scholars. See the refutation of his views by G. Brusin, "Su uno scavo"; V. Lazzarini, "Il preteso documento"; and E. Franceschini, "La cronachetta." The documents are collected in R. Cessi, "Documenti," I.

⁶⁸ On the relationship between Byzantium and early Venice see I. Armingaud, "Venise et le Bas-Empire"; E. Lentz, *Das Verhältnis*; *idem*, "Der allmähliche Übergang"; R. Cessi, "Le prime conseguenze."

centralization which lasted all through the eighth century. The year 726, a fateful date for the entire Greek Empire because of the promulgation of Leo III's iconoclastic policy, can be regarded as the beginning of the national history of Venice. In this year the *dux*, Ursus, was, for the first time, elected by the local *tribuni* and clergy, instead of being appointed by the emperor. This was the only part which the Venetians took in the Italian rebellion and it does not seem to have jeopardized their relations with the Empire, since the *dux* received the Byzantine court title of *hypatos*. The seat of the government was transferred to Malamocco. After Ursus' death in 737, however, the Emperor again installed his *magistri militum*, and it was only in 742 that a new *dux*, Deusdedit, was elected again by the *tribuni* and the clergy, and confirmed by the emperor. New difficulties led to the installation by the Byzantine government of two *tribuni* as controlling authorities, a measure which Doge Mauritius (764-787) sought to invalidate by having his own son nominated as co-regent. This was the first step towards the establishment of a ducal monarchy.

The first decades of the hereditary dogate are praised by the Venetian chroniclers as a golden age. It was in this time that Rialto-Olivolo grew so much in importance that an episcopal see was erected there in 774/75. The relations with Byzantium continued to be more or less peaceful. Mauritius bore the title *Magister militum, consul et imperialis dux Veneciarum provinciae*. Peace was broken in the beginning of the ninth century by the revolt of a frankophile party whose exponent, Obelierius, was elected doge in 804. The new Doge even went to the court of Charlemagne to receive Venetia from him as a fief. The Byzantine reaction to this step was prompt and effective. In 807 the Byzantine Patricius Nicetas appeared in the Adriatic at the head of a fleet and enforced the return of the Venetians to their former allegiance. Obelierius, however, was not only permitted to continue in his office but was also created an imperial *spatharios*. A punitive expedition of the Franks against Venetia ended with the conquest of Malamocco and, perhaps, Rialto, and the capture of Obelierius, but in a subsequent treaty between the two Empires the province was restored to Byzantium in exchange for the acknowledgment of Charlemagne's imperial title.

These incidents seem to have taught the Venetians that their most advantageous role would be that of a mediator and, if possible, of a *tertius gaudens* between the two Empires. In order to bring this about, it was necessary for Venice to loosen the bonds that connected her with the Eastern Empire, but to do so in a peaceful manner. More and more, Venice became the mediaeval counterpart of a Greek polis. The doges of the Partecipacii (Parteciaci) family who, in 811, transferred the government to Rialto, pursued this policy with astuteness and success. Justinian Partecipacius (827-829) styled himself *Imperialis hypatus et humilis dux Venetiae*, but it was he who found, in the *Translatio* of the relics of St. Mark to Venice, one of the means for the gradual secession of Venice from Byzantine domination. The acquisition of the new palladium was, indeed, more than a symptom of the growing tendencies towards independence; it can be regarded as an actual coup d'état. The former

tutulary saint of the dogate had been St. Theodore. A Greek warrior saint,⁶⁹ he befitted the original function of the *dux* as military commander of a Byzantine province and had been the symbol of Byzantine sovereignty. In the troubled reign of Agnellus Partecipacius (811-827), a short time before St. Theodore was ousted by the *Translatio* of the relics of the new ducal patron and soon after the transfer of the government to Rialto, a belated attempt seems to have been made by the Greek party to strengthen its grip on the Venetian State church by depositing in the newly erected cathedral of Olivolo (Castello) the relics of the Greek court patrons Sts. Sergius and Bacchus.⁷⁰ It was, however, an abortive attempt: the two Byzantine Saints could not compete with St. Peter to whom the cathedral was dedicated. A similar fate awaited St. Theodore. The chapel dedicated to him, the first ducal chapel of Rialto, the new seat of the Venetian government, is said to have been built in or shortly before 819 under the same Agnellus Partecipacius who erected the cathedral. The builder was a wealthy Greek, who, according to tradition, was named Narses, but later Venetian legend confused his name with that of the famous general of the sixth century. According to the *Chronicon Altinate*, the chapel was lavishly decorated with paintings and inscriptions.⁷¹ But both the Saint himself and his chapel lost their importance when the relics of St. Mark were transferred to Venice and the first church of the Evangelist was built. The very location of the new church of St. Mark is symbolic. It was squeezed in between the Ducal Palace and the former palace chapel of St. Theodore. Thus the Greek Saint was, as it were, elbowed out by the new national patron. The later history of the chapel of St. Theodore illustrates the oblivion to which the former ducal patron was committed. Burned down in the fire of 976,⁷² and perhaps restored afterwards together with San Marco, the chapel seems to have disappeared with the rebuilding of San Marco towards the end of the eleventh century. Most authors believe that it was incorporated in the structure of the new

⁶⁹ St. Theodore had thirteen churches in Constantinople: R. Janin, "Les églises byzantines des saints militaires," p. 56ff. The Saint venerated in Venice was St. Theodore Stratelates of Heraclea.

⁷⁰ *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 168.

⁷¹ H. Simonsfeld, *Venezianische Studien*, p. 48; G. Saccardo, "L'antica chiesa di S. Teodoro"; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.* pp. 65, 86, 203, 425, 429; L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," p. 27f. (this also discusses the controversy about the date of Narses).

The story of Narses is to be found in a passage of the *Chronicon Altinate* which is, however, a thirteenth-century interpolation. The narrative is vitiated by its fantastic quality; it depicts the aging patrician living in Venice as a monk, building churches—even laying the foundation stone of San Marco—and cultivating an intimate friendship with the doge—all in the sixth century. Further, he is said to have died in Venice, whence his body was taken to Byzantium for burial. Andrea Dandolo (*Chronicon*, col. 92) found this nonsense credible in the fourteenth century, and even in our day it has found an enthusiastic believer in G. Marzemin, *Le origini romane*, p. 237ff. He retains the sixth-century date of S. Teodoro (of which he claims to have found the remains in an arch behind San Marco) and its connection with the Patrician Narses. A critical treatment of the Narses problem is to be found in H. Simonsfeld, "Sulle scoperte," p. 117ff.

The Narses of the ninth century is identified by G. Saccardo, *op. cit.*, p. 100f., as the Greek admiral Nicetas Patricius, who resided in Venice during this critical time and fought against the Longobards and Franks; the thirteenth-century copyist of the *Chronicon Altinate* may have substituted for this more or less obscure personage the much better known Patricius Narses of the sixth century, the victor of the Goths.

⁷² According to the Chronicle of Johannes Diaconus: G. Monticolo, "Cronache," p. 139; *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 211.

church, most probably as a chapel in the place of the present Cappella S. Isidoro; but this question could be settled only by excavations to the north of San Marco, in the Piazzetta dei Leoncini.⁷³ Today no memory of the former protector of Venice is left in San Marco, excepting a few representations in mosaic of saints of this name. Remnants of a standing figure of a warrior saint with a dragon at his feet(?) are said to have been found on the eleventh-century façade beneath the present marble incrustation; it is not certain, however, that this was a figure of St. Theodore. Two other "Theodores" belong to the seventeenth century, and do not seem to have had mediaeval prototypes. A third St. Theodore is in a medallion on the north wall of the Cappella San Pietro, in a place which must be near the original location of the Chapel of St. Theodore; the Saint, however, is represented not as a warrior (Stratelates or Tiro), but as a martyr, together with St. Pantaleon. Thus it would appear that this medallion has nothing to do with the former state patron. Two further representations of a St. Theodore, a full-length figure in the southern arch of the northwest pillar of the Pentecost cupola, and one in the southern arch of the Tribuna della Fabbriceria, have figures of St. George as their counterpart. These, perhaps, could be representations of the former ducal patron, but they are identified only by their conjunction with his brother-in-arms. There is no other distinctive feature about these figures or their location. The former state saint has thus become an undistinguished member of the numerous host of Saints represented in the shrine of his successor. Nor were his reputed relics given a place in San Marco when they were transferred to Venice after the middle of the thirteenth century by Jacopo Dauro: they were placed instead in San Salvatore.⁷⁴ Finally, the statue of the Saint which tops one of the columns of the Piazzetta was not placed there until 1329, at a time when all danger of his competing with St. Mark had passed.⁷⁵

⁷³ G. Saccardo, *op. cit.*; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 112 f.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.* I, p. 86. Andrea Dandolo (*Chronicon*, col. 92) mentions the chapel as being *hodie infra moenia ecclesiae*. The chronicler Magno (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, no. 804) speaks of the chapel of S. Teodoro as having been converted into the present church of San Marco ("la qual poi fo convertida al nome del Divo Marcho Evangelista") as the old patron was succeeded by the new. Although this is not literally correct, it sums up very well the popular version of the facts. Somewhat enigmatic is the statement of the sixteenth-century chronicle of Daniele Barbaro (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, no. 820), that the chapel of S. Teodoro was rebuilt, together with the Ducal Palace, by Sebastiano Ziani (Doge, 1172-1178). Barbaro, who also mentions in this context the church of S. Giorgio, may have meant the church of S. Teodoro of Amasea, mentioned in the next note. The present chapel of S. Teodoro was built in 1486. (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 208).

⁷⁴ The relics of St. Theodore, taken from Mesembria by a Venetian admiral in 1257, were first placed in the Venetian church of St. Nicholas in Constantinople, whence they were transferred to Venice in 1267. Cf. G. Anrich, *Hagios Nikolaos*, II, p. 472; *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 336. This Theodore, who hailed from Heraclea, is not to be confused with St. Theodore of Amasea, the Patron Saint of another church of S. Teodoro in Venice. In an edict of 1450, reported by F. Corner (Fl. Cornelius, *Ecclesiae Venetae*, XIII, p. 399), the Senate says of St. Theodore: *Quia, ut notum est, per superiora et continua tempora Sanctus Theodorus fuit protector istius urbis nostrae una cum B. Marco Evangelista*. This shows that by the fifteenth century the political problem connected with S. Teodoro had been long forgotten. On the mosaic fragment of the façade see L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

⁷⁵ The two columns of the Piazzetta were set up soon after 1172 (H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, pp. 267, 380). The present statue ("il San Todaro") is not the original one of 1329, but a composite piece, made in the second half of the fifteenth century partly from antique fragments: L. Sartorio, "San Teodoro," p. 132 ff.; G. Mariacher, "Postilla," p. 230 ff.

The gradual transition from Byzantine sovereignty to suzerainty and, finally, to independence follows a course parallel to the gradual disappearance of the original Greek Patron Saint of the dogate. The development of Venice into an independent state took place mainly during the ninth and tenth centuries. The rising sea-power of the maritime settlements played an important part in this process. It gave the Venetians a new bargaining power in their relations with the Empire. Byzantium had to take account of this new sea-power and could, at times, depend on it. Byzantine emperors showered gifts and donations on the Venetians (S. Zaccaria, S. Ilario, S. Severo, and S. Lorenzo). In 879, Basil I sent an embassy to Venice to bestow on Doge Ursus Partecipacius (864-881) the title of protospatharius, a distinction which had already been conferred on Petrus Tradonicus in 841, but which from 879 onwards became *de rigueur* for Ursus' successors. Not being able to uphold its sovereignty over Venice by force, the Byzantine government was content with keeping or even buying the friendship of the new power. The doges, on the other hand, forced as they were by the expansionist policy of the German Empire, especially that of Conrad II, to secure for themselves the good will of Byzantium, not only avoided any move which, by questioning the right of Byzantine ^{SOVERAIGNTY} suzerainty might lead to an open break, but even brought about in the eleventh century an especially close rapprochement with Constantinople. It was, in fact, a rapprochement between allied powers. Venetian doges or their sons married Byzantine princesses and received new and more exalted court titles. The Venetians, however, were not content with Greek wives and titles. In 1082, after, and in payment for, their help against the Normans of Apulia, they received with the chrysobull of Alexius Comnenus a virtual trade monopoly within the Greek Empire.⁷⁶ It was at the height of this rapprochement, under the "Protosebastos" Domenico Contarini (1042-1071) and the "Protoproedros" Domenico Selvo (1071-1084), whose wife Theodora was a sister of the Byzantine Emperor Michael VII Ducas, that San Marco was rebuilt after the pattern of the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople.

The close relationship between Venice and the Eastern Empire continued under the next three doges, Vitale Falier (1084-1096), Vitale Michiel I (1096-1102) and Ordelaaffo Falier (1102-1118), under whom the magnificent Pala d'oro ^{DOSSAL} of the high altar of San Marco was made to order in Constantinople.⁷⁷ This reredos has come down to us with two modifications, one of 1209, when the Pala was enlarged, and the other of 1345, when it was once more reset.⁷⁸ Never-

⁷⁶ On the chrysobull see W. Heyd, *Geschichte des Levantehandels*, I, p. 132 ff. On the Byzantine titles of the doges: V. Lazzarini, "I titoli."

⁷⁷ G. Veludo, "La Pala d'oro," in A. Pasini, *op. cit.*, p. 141 ff., with bibliography up to 1886; G. Veludo, *The Pala d'oro*, with bibliography; J. Ebersolt, *Les arts somptuaires*, p. 94; W. Bucher, *Die Zellenschmelze*; S. Bettini, "La Pala d'oro"; the doctoral thesis on the Pala d'oro by Dr. Jasminka Pomorišćak-De Luigi (Basel-Venice) has not yet been published.

⁷⁸ The documentary evidence, including the fourteenth-century inscriptions on the Pala itself, is not as dependable and as detailed as might be desired. The tradition that part of the present Pala goes back to the time of Pietro Orseolo (991-1009) has been wrongly discredited (thus, F. Zanotto in *Venezia e le sue lagune*, II/2, p. 82). It is to be found in the *Chronicon* of John the Deacon (MGHS, VII, p. 26) and in that of Andrea Dandolo (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, no. 39); similarly in P. Gradenigo (*ibid.*, no. 38) and Bemba (*ibid.*, no. 42). There was certainly an earlier Pala, the memory of which

theless, the Pala exhibits two portraits which, if properly understood, characterize the relationship between Byzantium and Venice at the very beginning of the twelfth century. To the left of the Virgin is the figure of Ordelaaffo Falier, the Doge who, in 1105, ordered the Pala to be made; to the right is the figure of the Byzantine Empress Irene. This is a most curious combination and it would be tempting to assume that the present portrait of the Doge, which shows indubitable traces of having been tampered with, was originally the portrait of Irene's husband, the Emperor Alexius Comnenus.⁷⁹ The costume of the figure, however, argues decisively against this supposition. The boots are blue, not red as they would have to be in the case of an emperor; the scepter, also blue and not red, is shorter than that of Irene, and the garments are not consistent with the representation of a Byzantine basileus. The figure is, furthermore, shorter than that of the Empress and, finally, the inscription with the name of the Doge seems to be original. It is, therefore, almost certain that the Doge's figure is original (dating from 1105), with the exception of the head, which was altered, and the halo, which was added later. It is, on the other hand, quite impossible to assume that the figure of the Doge was, from the beginning, the counterpart of the figure of the Empress. The solution of this difficulty, as suggested by Dr. Pomorišac-De Luigi,⁸⁰ seems to be that in 1105 there were four figures of rulers or donors grouped on either side of the Virgin: the Emperor Alexius with his Empress Irene in the middle, flanked by the Doge and the Co-Emperor John II Comnenus on the outside. This assumption would seem to solve all pertinent questions with the exception of one: what has happened to the figures of the two Byzantine Emperors? The date 1209, when the first alteration of the Pala took place under Doge Pietro Ziani and the Procurator Angelo Falier, may give the answer. In remodelling the Pala five years after the conquest of Constantinople and the foundation of the colonial empire of the Levant, it must have

survived in the chronicles quoted; and some of the larger medallions set into the new arrangement of the fourteenth century may be remnants of the Orseolo Pala. However, in accordance with the fourteenth-century inscription, it is now agreed that the main part of the present Pala was made in Constantinople on the order of Ordelaaffo Falier in 1105 (see documents nos. 68-72, and 812, in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*); that the Pala was enlarged and rearranged under Doge Pietro Ziani and the Procurator Angelo Falier in 1209 to include looted objects from the Impresa (*ibid.*, *Documenti* nos. 88, 89); and that it was once more reset in 1345 under Doge Andrea Dandolo (*ibid.*, *Documenti*, nos. 102, 103, 812, 830; inscription). The Pala was cleaned in 1647 (*ibid.*, no. 467), 1720 (*ibid.*, no. 960) and in the nineteenth century. Although the dates of the single enamels are controversial, it should not be too difficult to determine the shares of the tenth, the early twelfth and the early thirteenth centuries respectively; the present lower part represents roughly the Pala of 1105, the upper part the additions from the Constantinopolitan booty of the early thirteenth century with the use of remnants from the Orseolo Pala. The small enamels of the frame were reset in 1345, but, in part, they may have belonged to either of the two groups, and, in part, may have been added in 1345 from other sources. There are two conflicting traditions about the provenance of the large plaques; they were either from St. Sophia or the Pantocrator Church in Constantinople. Cf. G. Veludo, *The Pala d'oro*, pp. 11, 50. See also *infra*, note 90.

⁷⁹ Following J. Ebersolt, *op. cit.*, p. 94; S. Lambros, *Catalogue illustré*, p. 43; and G. Veludo in A. Pasini, *op. cit.*, p. 148, I have myself made this erroneous assumption in O. Demus, "Gesellschaftsbild," p. 89ff., esp. p. 92f. I should like to thank Dr. Pomorišac-De Luigi for having communicated to me her criticism of my identification and her own theory which I believe to be correct, and on which the following interpretation is based.

⁸⁰ E. Molinier, *L'émaillerie*, p. 42, suggested that the present figure of the Doge was originally that of John II Comnenus. Mr. Marvin Ross, who is preparing a comprehensive study on Byzantine enamels, has been kind enough to read the above passage on the Pala d'oro in manuscript. He tells me that he is not convinced by Dr. Pomorišac's theory.

been impossible for the Venetians to suffer the images of the two Byzantine Emperors to remain on the Pala of the high altar of their state church. The two plaques had to be removed and were probably supplanted by two inscription plaques, the predecessors of the present inscriptions of 1345. The portrait of the Doge, an ancestor of the procurator then in office, was given a halo and moved nearer the center, to form a pendant to the figure of the Empress. The latter's image could be allowed to remain: Irene Ducas, Alexius' second wife, was a relative of Theodora Ducas, the wife of Doge Domenico Selvo. If this hypothesis is correct, the Pala of 1105 showed the Doge of Venice, together with the imperial couple and the Co-Emperor; the Doge appeared on the same level as the latter and almost as a member of the imperial family, a perfect illustration of the rapprochement between the two powers. A few years later this would have been impossible. The conflict with Byzantium began when John II Comnenus (1118-1143) refused, on his accession to the imperial throne, to renew the chrysobull. Hostilities, interrupted by negotiations, followed until John renewed the chrysobull in 1126; but the subsequent relationship between the two powers remained an uneasy one, even though Manuel Comnenus (1143-1180) ratified the privileges once more in 1147 and permitted an enlargement of the Venetian colony in Byzantium. Things went from bad to worse when in 1151 the Venetians seceded from a coalition against the Normans of Sicily, the common enemy. For some time a Greek fleet even occupied Ancona. The precarious peace that was patched up soon afterwards was broken again in 1167 when the Venetians sided with Hungary against Byzantium. In 1170/71 the situation was such that Doge Vitale Michiel II (1156-1172) intended to summon home the Venetian merchants who had settled in Constantinople. Manuel seemed to give in, but only to deal a crushing blow in 1171 by incarcerating all the Venetians living within the confines of his empire. Again there was war, infrequently interrupted by embassies; in 1175 Venice concluded a treaty with William II of Sicily with openly hostile intentions against Byzantium. In 1176, however, an understanding was reached, and the Venetian trade privileges were renewed, though only for a stipulated payment which the Venetians actually never paid. In the meantime, Venice had also extended her sphere of interest westward. As a result of the masterly diplomacy of Sebastiano Ziani (1172-1178), Venice in 1177 was able to play the part of mediator in the struggle between Frederick Barbarossa and Pope Alexander III. The Pactum of Venice which was brought about by the good offices of Ziani not only put an end to the disturbances which had consumed the energies of Italy and Germany, it also opened up a new epoch of Venetian expansion northward and westward: Venice received privileges for free trade in the Holy Roman Empire.

The Venetians could afford to await their chance in the East. Hostilities with Byzantium flared up again 1182 with the usurpation of the Byzantine throne by Andronicus I, when most of the Latins living in Constantinople were massacred. The following two decades were turbulent. Although Andronicus' successor, Isaac II Angelus (1185-1195), renewed the chrysobull in 1187 and Alexius III Angelus (1195-1203) did so once more in 1198, the tension moved towards a

catastrophe. This came with the deflection of the Fourth Crusade to Constantinople and with the taking of the city in 1204.⁸¹

Thus most of the twelfth century was filled with altercations and hostilities between Venice and its former sovereign. Venice suffered heavy losses in this struggle, but finally liberated herself from the last traces of subjection. Although actually independent from the tenth century onwards, she still had had to keep up the appearance of submission. From 1118 onwards there was no more question of Byzantine suzerainty, and in 1204, the relationship was reversed: the Doge of Venice became the *Dominator quartae et dimidiaie partis totius Romaniae* and a Venetian patriarch established his see in St. Sophia.⁸² Enrico Dandolo (1192-1205), the conqueror of Constantinople, usurped not only an essential part of the Byzantine emperor's powers and domains but also his type of coinage. He adopted (perhaps even before the actual taking of Constantinople) for his silver grosso the design of the coins of his arch-enemies, Manuel and Andronicus, with the enthroned Pantocrator on the reverse and the investiture of the ruler on the obverse. This investiture was, however, represented on the grossi with one characteristic alteration: the vexillum was handed to the doge not by the Virgin but by St. Mark.⁸³ The *Padrone* had become the real *Signor*, the doge his vicegerent.

In the distribution of the spoils of the Impresa, the Evangelist received, as befitted his zoomorphic symbol,⁸⁴ the lion's share. The transport of loot to Venice began in 1204 and lasted till the fall of the Latin Empire in 1261. San Marco received as raw material columns, capitals, and slabs of marble, rare stones and smalt for mosaics.⁸⁵ One chronicle even says that the greater part of the church was "built" (*fabricada*) from this material.⁸⁶ Constantinople was not the only place from which Venetian commanders and merchants brought home precious material for the decoration of San Marco. The entire Levant was considered as

⁸¹ For the foregoing, see esp. H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 213 ff.; R. Bistort, *La repubblica di Venezia*; H. F. Brown, "The Venetians . . . in Constantinople"; G. Cassi, *Il Mare Adriatico*, p. 143 ff.; R. Cessi, *Storia*, p. 139 ff.; *idem*, *La repubblica*; W. C. Hazlitt, *The Venetian Republic*, I, p. 150 ff.; W. Lenel, *Die Entstehung*; R. Morozzo della Rocca and A. Lombardo, *Documenti*, I; C. Neumann, "Über die urkundlichen Quellen," p. 366 ff.; M. Roberti, *Ricerche*; P. Sarpi, *Il dominio*; A. Frolov, *Recherches*; and the bibliography quoted *supra*, in note 60.

⁸² H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 269 ff., II, p. 3 ff. Sources and bibliography on the Fourth Crusade are quoted *ibid.*, I, p. 474 ff.; on Constantinople, the Latin Empire, and the Levant, *ibid.*, II, p. 558 ff. To this are to be added the recent works by R. Cessi, *Le colonie*, I; Robert de Clari, *La conquête de Constantinople* (transl. P. Charlot); A. Fabietti, *Le crociate*; Geoffroy de Villehardouin, *La conquête* (ed. and transl. E. Faral); H. Grégoire, "The Diversion," p. 158 ff.; R. Grousset, *L'empire*; R. Janin, "Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine," p. 134 ff.; *idem*, "Les sanctuaires des colonies latines," p. 163 ff.; J. Longnon, *L'empire latin*; W. Miller, *Essays on the Latin Orient*; L. Santifaller, *Beiträge*; L. Streit, "Venezia e la quarta crociata," pp. 50 ff., 234 ff.; C. Verlinden, *Les empereurs*; S. Xanthoudides, *Ἡ Ἐκτοκράτεια*.

According to F. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 233, scenes from the conquest of Constantinople were depicted in the chapel of St. Nicholas, built by Pietro Ziani in the Ducal Palace. The wall paintings were in green chiaroscuro.

⁸³ N. Papadopoli, *Le monete*, I, p. 87 f.; *idem*, "Enrico Dandolo"; H. C. Peyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 16 f., 73.

⁸⁴ On the Lion of St. Mark as the State symbol see B. Timarchi, "Il leone"; A. Santalena, *Leoni*; N. Papadopoli, *Il leone*; S. Musatti, *op. cit.*

⁸⁵ *Le Ducale Basilica*, *Documenti*, p. 11, no. 87, p. 211, no. 823.

⁸⁶ The Chronicle of Andrea Dandolo, Italian version: "In lo qual tempo [after the Impresa of Constantinople] la più parte de la Giexia de Messer San Marco fo fabricada delle piere colonne et Zoieli adutti de Constantinopoli con Gallie et Nave." *La Ducale Basilica*, *Documenti*, p. 211, no. 823.

a quarry from which Venice could legitimately draw.⁸⁷ Together with building and decorative material, there came to Venice the three pulpits and the ciborium of the Capitello Altar⁸⁸ harboring the miracle-working crucifix which, together with the Icon of the Nikopeia, had formed part, so it was believed, of the most highly treasured possessions of Byzantium.⁸⁹ Everything that could serve to embellish San Marco was looted, from enamel plaques for the enlargement of the Pala d'oro⁹⁰ and precious relics, reliquaries, chalices, icons, etc. for the Tesoro⁹¹ to reliefs for the walls of the church⁹² and the gilded horses which were placed, after a brief sojourn at the Arsenal, on the façade of San Marco.⁹³

The Venetians had every opportunity for systematic looting in Constantinople and in the Levant in general. It is quite clear that they regarded Constantinople as their domain, even if the information contained in later chronicles about a plan to transfer the seat of the Venetian government to Constantinople is incorrect.⁹⁴ Venice was the only real power, politically and ecclesiastically, behind the shadow Empire of the Latins. Towards the end of the Empire, in 1259, Baldwin II was forced to give his only son, Philip, as surety to a Venetian ban-

⁸⁷ This practice was not new in 1204. Venetian chronicles report that it was already in use at the end of the eleventh century when Doge Domenico Selvo ordered his admirals and captains to collect precious material for San Marco. See *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 6, nos. 49-52, 55, 56. Similar orders were issued once more in 1309 by Doge Piero Gradenigo (*ibid.*, p. 13, no. 99). On single items which came to Venice in the thirteenth century: E. Cicogna, *I due gruppi*; G. Saccardo, "I pilastri"; F. Kieslinger, "Le transenne." The columns of the little aediculae of the presbytery walls were reputed to have been taken from a loggia of the House of Pilate in Jerusalem.

⁸⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 203, and *ibid.*, *Documenti*, p. 211, no. 822; *ibid.*, *Portafoglio V*, pls. 289-293, 359. The Crucifix itself is, in its present state, a work of the Ducento; it was probably repainted after a sacrilegious attack. Having originally stood on the Piazza, it was transferred to the interior of San Marco in 1290.

⁸⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 210, no. 821. The Byzantines lost the image of the Nikopeia to the Crusaders during a sortie from besieged Constantinople in 1204. G. Tiepolo, *Trattato*; D. Canal, *Brevi cenni*. The identification attempted by G. Veludo, *Imagines*, with the Hodegetria from the Blachernae (Blacherniotissa) is surely wrong. See *Venezia e le sue lagune*, II/2, p. 51, and R. L. Wolff, "Footnote to an Incident." The Nikopeia was placed on the altar in the north transept in 1618.

⁹⁰ To the booty of the Impresa may belong many of the small medallions with which the present Pala is studded. Others may have come from the Orseolo Pala, but the main additions of 1209 are the large plaques of the upper part, with six representations of a feast cycle and a large figure of an angel: the feast plaques form only half of a complete feast cycle, which may have been divided up among several claimants in the partition of the booty; the angel, in three-quarter profile, must have belonged to a larger, symmetrical ensemble. Some of the enamels are said to have been recognized, in 1438, by Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople, as having belonged to the Pantocrator Church of Constantinople (G. Veludo, "La Pala," in A. Pasini, *op. cit.*, p. 152). The identification is questionable because it rested on the portraits of the donors of the Comnene family which certainly belonged to the Pala of 1105. See *supra* p. 23 ff.

⁹¹ A. Pasini, *op. cit.*; E. Molinier, *Le trésor*. There is, as yet, no adequate publication of the Treasure of San Marco. J. Ebersolt, *Constantinople*, I, p. 105 ff., mentions, as belonging to the booty of Constantinople, two reliquaries of the True Cross; the relics of Christ's swaddling clothes, of the towel of the Washing of the Feet, and of the Sacro Sindone; two relics of the Sacred Blood, a fragment of the Virgin's Girdle, a domed reliquary, chalices, etc. See also L. Marangoni, "Un infisso."

⁹² See *infra*, book three.

⁹³ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 11, nos. 86, 87, p. 210, nos. 812, 821. *Ibid.*, *Testo*, p. 424 ff. A. dall'Aqua Giusti, *I quattro cavalli*. According to F. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 312, the four horses which were taken from the hippodrome of Constantinople by the Podestà Marino Zeno were for some time placed in front of the Arsenal. By the middle of the thirteenth century, however, they were already in their present place, on the façade of San Marco. See H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 488 (after P. Rannusius, *De bello*, p. 129-131); G. Zanella, *I cavalli*; G. Damerini, "I cavalli"; L. Morel d'Arleux, "Les tribulations"; C. Koch, "Antike Rosse"; Th. Kluge and K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die römischen Grossbronzen*, II, p. 77.

⁹⁴ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, p. 558. This suggestion is reported to have been made in 1219 or 1222.

ker for the payment of sums he had borrowed. Philip was taken to Venice and his father was unable to redeem him until after the fall of the capital to the Greeks. In ecclesiastic matters, too, Venice had the greatest influence, although it did not have its way entirely. The first Latin patriarch of St. Sophia, the Venetian Tommaso Morosini, who was elected at the instigation of the Doge and Podesta Enrico Dandolo, had, it is true, to give sworn assurance that he would install only Venetians as canons of the Great Church, and the latter had to promise to elect only Venetians as patriarchs; but a year later, in 1206, this oath was annulled by Pope Innocent. There were even serious difficulties between Morosini and the Venetian government, whose political concepts tended towards the subordination of the "Latin" Church to the patriarchate of Grado. Morosini found supporters in the Emperor and the Pope—and Venice had to give in. When Morosini died in 1211, the next patriarch was again a Venetian.⁹⁵ Among the more important churches of Constantinople, the Venetians held, in addition to St. Sophia, those of the Pantocrator with its monastery and hospital, of Christ Pantepoptes, of Mary Peribleptos, and of St. Mark. Furthermore, Venetians exerted considerable influence in the churches of Sta Maria de Cinc-tura (Theotokos Chalkoprateia), of the Holy Apostles (whose provost supported the Venetian candidate for the patriarchate in 1212), of St. Barbara, and many others. Relics were, officially and privately, taken to Venice from a number of these and other churches; thus the relics of St. Simeon were taken from the Chalkoprateia, those of St. Paul Martyr from Christ Pantepoptes, and those of St. Paul the Hermit from Mary Peribleptos.⁹⁶

Outside Constantinople the position of the Venetians was, if possible, even stronger than in the capital of the Empire. Some of the Venetian possessions in the Levant dated from much earlier times. The foundations of their colonial empire were laid as early as 1100, when for her help in the First Crusade, Venice received the privilege of free trade in the kingdom of Jerusalem, as well as the possession of the town of Tripoli and privileges in Tyre. Much later, some of the income from these possessions and privileges was turned over to San Marco. From 1164 onward, an annual sum of 300 Byzantii (gold pieces) was received from the Kingdom of Jerusalem, and in 1175 another substantial donation, namely, the proceeds from their one-third share of the town of Tyre which the Venetians had acquired in the expedition of 1124/25, under Domenico Michiel. A rock on which Christ was said to have rested or preached was taken from Tyre to be installed eventually in the Baptistery of San Marco, and the relics of St. Isidore were acquired from Chios (1125). It is a tribute to their perspicacity that the Venetians did not take an active part in the Second Crusade and had no share in the failures of 1146/47. Not until 1189 did Venetian ships again help in transporting Crusaders to the Holy Land, but the participation of the Venetians in the Third Crusade certainly lacked ardour. They saw as their enemy not the Saracens but the Greeks. The year 1204 brought the reckoning; and

⁹⁵ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 6-9; L. Santifaller, *op. cit.*, p. 17 ff.; R. L. Wolff, "Politics."

⁹⁶ R. Janin, "Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine," pp. 151-176. P. E. D. Riant, *Des dépouilles*, p. 178 ff.

now not only the Republic itself, but individual Venetian families as well carved out for themselves duchies and principalities in the Levant, which became strongholds of Venetian seapower and trade.⁹⁷ From the Aegean, Venetian trade reached out towards Egypt and Tunisia. An inscription in San Marco, in which the Patron Saint is asked to extend his protection to "Libia," may possibly refer to Tunisia.⁹⁸ St. Mark had good reasons for showing special favor to the dominions in the Levant: the procuratia of San Marco drew a good part of its income from this region, and it seems that before the establishment of glass manufacture in Venice itself the mosaic material for the decoration of the church, insofar as it was not acquired in Constantinople or looted from existing mosaics in the Byzantine Empire, was largely imported from Tyre and other Venetian workshops in the Levant.⁹⁹

Venetian hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean was not, however, undisputed. The most dangerous enemy of the Republic, Genoa, saw to it that the Venetians were not allowed to rest on their laurels. Genoa's persistent hostility and two lengthy wars (1257-1270; 1294-1299) taxed the resources of Venice to the utmost. Thus all the greater importance was attached to the trophies won by the Venetians at the beginning of the first of these wars. The Pillars of Acre and the Pietra del Bando, which had been doorposts of the castle San Saba and symbols of Genoese jurisdiction in Acre, were shipped to Venice in 1258 and placed before the side entrance of San Marco, as monumental memorials of a Venetian victory.¹⁰⁰ However, Genoa too had its victories: the greatest was the reconquest of Constantinople by the Greeks with Genoese help in 1261. It was a heavy blow for Venice and caused great damage both to its prosperity and to its prestige. It was only natural that Michael Palaeologus, again enthroned in the capital of a new Byzantine Empire, should, at first, lean on the Genoese and concede to them the position which the Venetians had held before. The Genoese were, however, uneasy allies for the Palaeologi and in the treaties of 1267, 1277, and 1285, Venice was able slowly to win back some, though not all, of her former privileges. It was only with the last of these dates—a date of the greatest importance for the history of Venetian art—that relations between Venice and the Greek Empire again became normal. The treaties were renewed

⁹⁷ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 213 ff., 233, 272 f., II, pp. 15 ff., 561 ff., with bibliography, and B. Dudan, *Il dominio*. The donations of 1164 and 1175 in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 10, nos. 81, 82.

⁹⁸ The inscription, which is restored, adorns one of the central arches in San Marco and reads: *Italam, Libiam, Venetos, sicut leo, Marce, | Doctrina, tumulto, requie, fremituque tueris*. Here, however, *Libia* may stand for the entire dominion of the Levant. Trade treaties with Egypt were concluded between 1202 and 1217 (L. Streit, "Venezia," pp. 262, 268 ff.; W. Heyd, *Geschichte*, I, p. 378 ff.); those with the "Sultan of Tunisia," were renewed in 1251 and 1254 (R. Cessi, *Storia*, p. 236 f.); with Bagdad there were trade treaties from the end of the twelfth century (L. Streit, *loc. cit.*).

⁹⁹ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 370, II, pp. 144, 1285 f., 590; B. Cecchetti, *Delle origini ... dell' arte vetraria*; *idem*, *Monografia*; A. Santi, "Origine"; G. Monticolo, "L'arte dei fiolieri." The earliest occurrence of the term *fiolarius* (glassmaker) is to be found in a decree of 1090, but it is unlikely that smalt for mosaics was produced in Venice before the second quarter of the thirteenth century.

¹⁰⁰ G. Saccardo, "I pilastri," p. 285 ff. after the chronicles of Magno and Daniele Barbaro. Saccardo assumes that the eastern pillar was originally placed to the west of the other. In this way the two pillars would have flanked the southern side-entrance to the atrium, which is now closed and forms the south wall of the Cappella Zeno. See also M. Kalligas, *Oi Ηεροοί*.

in 1302 and 1310, and the Venetian quarter in Constantinople could hold its own against Genoese power. In 1332 Venice even concluded a pact of mutual assistance with Andronicus III against the Turks; another league in 1351 with John Cantacuzene was directed against Genoa. This rapprochement between Venice and Byzantium once more bore its fruits in Venetian art. One hundred and two years later the Venetian colony of Constantinople shared the last struggle of the capital against the Turks. A Venetian fleet was sent to relieve the defenders, but came too late.¹⁰¹

V. ST. MARK AND ST. HERMAGORAS: VENICE, GRADO, AND AQUILEIA

Venice borrowed or, rather, usurped its Patron Saint, the Evangelist Mark, from Aquileia, which had acquired him as the mythical founder of the Adriatic episcopate in or after the fifth century. Thus, Aquileia's rights were certainly older, though not much better founded, than those of Venice. The claim of the Aquileian church to apostolic foundation had found its most effective and probably earliest expression in the *Passio* of Sts. Hermagoras and Fortunatus.¹⁰² The first and most important of these two Saints does not belong to the original pantheon of indigenous martyrs which comprised the names and relics of Cantius, Cantianus and Cantianilla, Chrysogonus, Protus, Felix and Fortunatus, Hilarius, Tatianus and Valerianus. Not even his name is authentic. The form "Hermagoras," adopted and fixed for posterity by the *Passio*, seems to go back to a scribe's error in the *Martyrium Hieronymianum* (under July 12th) where the faulty form "Armager" stands for the correct "Hermogenes." The latter, a martyred "lector" of Singidunum (Belgrade), was, together with his companion Fortunatus, a late comer to Aquileia, the relics and cult of the two martyrs having been introduced by Pannonian Catholics on their flight from Ataulf in the beginning of the fifth century. For the very reason that there could be no historical data or even legends connected with the garbled form of the name "Armager," the two Saints were chosen by the author of the *Passio* as convenient protagonists of a freely invented legend, the aim of which was to connect the Aquileian church with the apostolic age. Hermagoras was made a disciple of St. Mark, and Fortunatus the follower of Hermagoras. It did not disturb the author of the *Passio* and subsequent upholders of Aquileia's claims to apostolic foundation that the cult of the authentic Pannonian Saint, Hermogenes, lived on peacefully, side by side with the cult of the "usurper" Hermagoras, and that no fewer than three Fortunati were venerated in the Aquileian church: the indigenous Aquileian martyr (paired with St. Felix), the authentic companion of Hermogenes, and the invented companion of Hermagoras. At the *inventio* of the relics in the late tenth or early eleventh century, four *capsellae* were found in Grado, containing the relics of Sts. Felix and Fortunatus, Sts. Hermagoras and Fortunatus, Sts. Dionysius and Largus, and Sts. Hermogenes

¹⁰¹ For the foregoing see H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, *passim* and pp. 574, 603f., 616f., 633ff., with bibliography.

¹⁰² For this and the following see R. Egger, "Hermagoras," the *Passio* on p. 40ff., and P. Paschini, "Le fasi," p. 161ff.

and Fortunatus.¹⁰³ By a curious fate, the cult of the fictitious Sts. Hermagoras and Fortunatus, invented solely for providing a link with St. Mark and, through him, with St. Peter, outlived in Aquileia that of St. Mark himself, which, from the ninth century onward, was monopolized by Venice.

In inventing this link with the apostolic age, Aquileia followed the example of Milan, as it had done in founding the churches of the apostles in Aquileia itself and in Concordia. In Milan a similar attempt had been made in the fifth century by fabricating the legend of St. Nazarius, whose mother allegedly received baptism at the hands of St. Peter, and by inventing at a later date the legend of the "Apostle" St. Barnabas, who was also made one of the founders of the Milanese church.¹⁰⁴ Ravenna followed suit with the legend of St. Apollinaris, the alleged disciple of St. Peter.¹⁰⁵ Similar, if less determined, attempts were made in Verona with St. Euprepus and in Padua with St. Prosdocimus,¹⁰⁶ both alleged pupils of St. Peter and, considerably later, in Saint-Denis with St. Dionysius, and in Périgueux with St. Front.¹⁰⁷

It will be noticed that the Italian cities that claimed these makeshift apostles—all of them linked with St. Peter—belonged to the orbits of Milan, Aquileia, and Ravenna, the very religious centers in which the cult of the relics of the apostles had previously taken root with the foundation of apostles' churches. It seems, indeed, as if the fabrication of legends connecting the beginnings of these religious centers with the apostles themselves and, especially, with St. Peter, had been the logical outcome of the cult of apostolic relics engendered by the ecclesiastic policy of St. Ambrose.

Aquileia's special aim in perpetrating the fabrication of its legendary foundation—the first of a long series of inventions and forgeries—was to be recognized as one of the patriarchal sees of Christianity. The bishops of Aquileia were to be regarded as the successors of St. Mark,¹⁰⁸ just as those of Rome and Antioch were the successors of St. Peter, those of Jerusalem the successors of St. James the Less, those of Constantinople the followers of St. Andrew, and—most pertinently—the patriarchs of Alexandria the successors of St. Mark. Aquileia, in fact, aimed at supplanting Alexandria as the Marcan patriarchate, on the strength of the assertion that Mark had founded the Church of Aquileia prior to that of Alexandria.

¹⁰³ This list of relics occurs identically in four manuscripts of the fourteenth century, three of which refer the *inventio* to the year 1023/24, while the fourth (Dandolo's Italian Chronicle, p. 238) attributes it to the year 922. R. Egger, *op. cit.*, p. 223; G. Monticolo, "La *inventio* . . . dei SS. Ermagora e Fortunato," p. 117 ff.

¹⁰⁴ R. Egger, *op. cit.*, p. 230. The Barnabas legend was taken up by Paulus Diaconus and the *Martyrologium Romanum parvum*, quoted by R. Egger, *op. cit.*; see also R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, II, p. 305.

¹⁰⁵ O. G. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress*, p. 51 f.; *idem*, "Zu den Mosaiken," p. 105. The *Passio Sancti Apollinaris in Acta Sanctorum*, July 5, p. 344 ff.

¹⁰⁶ R. Egger, "Hermagoras," p. 232; A. Barzon, *S. Prosdocimo*. A similarly abortive attempt was made in Arles with St. Trophimus at the beginning of the fifth century; the claim was refused in 450 by Leo I (R. Egger, *op. cit.*, p. 229).

¹⁰⁷ A. Grabar, "Saint-Front," p. 501 ff.

¹⁰⁸ The chronological series of the bishops of Aquileia has been recently studied by E. Klebel, "Zur Geschichte," p. 396 ff. On the role of St. Andrew in the history of the Constantinopolitan Church see F. Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity*.

It is recorded that these claims were known in Rome about the middle of the sixth century, and that they were at first frowned upon as based on *confictae approbationes*.¹⁰⁹ This rebuff seems to have been aimed not so much at the title "Patriarcha," an honorific epithet which had been used occasionally by other bishops in the early period of the Church and was freely bestowed on the metropolitans of Milan and Ravenna,¹¹⁰ as at the claim to apostolic foundation. In the seventh century, however, Rome seems to have given in, and Aquileia's claims were accepted. By the beginning of the eighth century the title of patriarch, with all its implications, was in common use.¹¹¹

But not for Aquileia alone; in the meantime events had occurred that threatened to deprive Aquileia of the fruits of its machinations. The patriarchate had split in two, and Grado, the offshoot, bade fair to inherit all of Aquileia's claims. The origin and early development of the "Aquileian schism"¹¹²—one of the most heatedly discussed problems in the history of the Italian Church of the Middle Ages—are shrouded in the mists of the migration period and obscured by a number of forgeries perpetrated by both sides. The bare facts are as follows: In the fifth century the island of Grado had served as a convenient but temporary shelter for the population and clergy of Aquileia. In A.D. 568 when the Longobards overran Italy, Grado was again chosen as a refuge. This time, however, the intention of the metropolitan Bishop Paulinus seems to have been to remain in Grado, which belonged to the Byzantine province of Venetia. It is recorded that he took with him the treasure of the Aquileian Church, including its relics. This "secessio" was, of course, against the interests of the Longobard rulers of the mainland, who must have viewed

¹⁰⁹ R. Egger, "Hermagoras," p. 226f.; F. Lanzoni, *Le origini*, p. 506ff., analyses a letter of Pope Pelagius I (558–560) to the Patricius Johannes of Ravenna (Migne, *PL*, LXIX, p. 411) in which the Pope "reprivò il titolo [*Patriarcha Istriae et Veneciae*] novellamente assunto dal metropolita aquileiese," and characterized the "proofs" of Aquileia as fabrications (*confictae approbationes*).

¹¹⁰ W. Lenel, "Studien," pt. 1: "Über das Aufkommen des Patriarchentitels bei den Erzbischöfen von Aquileia und Grado," p. 100ff.

¹¹¹ W. Lenel, *ibid.*, p. 100ff.; F. Lanzoni, *op. cit.*, p. 508f.

¹¹² All the sources for the study of the Aquileian schism and the history of the patriarchate must be used with caution. These are: the earlier Venetian chronicles, from Paulus Diaconus to Andrea Dandolo, especially the *Chronica de singulis patriarchis Novae Aquileiae*, ed. G. Monticolo, "Cronache," p. 3ff.; the so-called *Chronica delle origini del Patriarchato di Grado*, *ibid.*, p. 55ff., actually a forged privilege of Pope Pelagius II, contained in different versions in the *Chronicon Altinate* and the *Chronicon Gradense*; the not entirely authentic acts of the Synod of Mantua of 827, in J. D. Mansi, *Collectio*, XIV, p. 494ff., and MGH, *Concilia*, II, p. 583ff.; the partly forged acts of a Grado synod of Patriarch Helias, in F. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, ed. N. Coleti, V, p. 27ff.; Dandolo's *Chronicle*, col. 98ff.; R. Cessi, "Nova Aquileia," p. 588ff.; and several Papal letters and privileges, published by P. F. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia*, VII/1, 2, *passim*. Most of the documentary and historical evidence is also collected in B. M. De Rubeis, *Monumenta*. P. F. Kehr, *ibid.*, VII/1, p. 8ff., has marshalled the bibliography on the history of the Patriarchate of Grado. The more important studies of this subject are the following:

1. Comprehensive works: G. Cappelletti, *Storia*, I, p. 42ff.; B. M. De Rubeis, *Monumenta*; H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, p. 22ff.; K. Lanckoroński, *Der Dom*; F. Lanzoni, *Le diocesi*; *ibid.*, *Le origini*, p. 490ff.; *La basilica di Aquileia*, *passim*.
2. Special studies: R. Cessi, "Nova Aquileia," p. 543ff.; R. Egger, "Hermagoras"; P. F. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig"; P. S. Leicht, "La chiesa"; W. Lenel, "Studien"; *ibid.*, *Die Entstehung*; G. Marchetti-Longhi, "Il patriarcato"; W. Meyer, "Die Spaltung"; A. Monteverde, "Il concilio"; P. Paschini, "Sulle origini"; *ibid.*, "La chiesa aquileiese"; *ibid.*, "Le vicende . . . da Costantino a Carlo Magno"; *ibid.*, "Note storiche"; *ibid.*, *San Paolino*; *ibid.*, "Le vicende politiche nei sec. IX e X"; *ibid.*, "Vicende del Friuli"; *ibid.*, "I patriarchi"; H. Schmidinger, "Patriarch," pp. 1–17; D. Tassini, *La questione*.

with grave concern the fact that a part of their dominions was under the ecclesiastic jurisdiction of a prelate who resided outside their realm. These political considerations led, in 607, to a double election in which, after the death of Severus of Grado, two patriarchs were chosen, Candidianus in Grado and Johannes in Aquileia, the former with the help of Smaragdus, the Byzantine exarch of Ravenna, the latter under the patronage of the Longobard Duke Gisulf. Thus there were two patriarchs who claimed to be the legitimate successors of St. Mark. The Grado bishop styled himself patriarch, not of Grado, but of Nova Aquileia, thereby expressing the belief that the see of old Aquileia had been legitimately transferred to "New Aquileia," i.e. Grado.

Rome and Byzantium stood behind Grado-Nova Aquileia, both for political reasons and because Candidianus had, for a time, renounced the schismatic beliefs of his predecessors who had taken the wrong side in the controversy over the Three Chapters. Johannes of Aquileia, on the other hand, remained a schismatic, and did not recognize the findings of the Fifth Oecumenical Council of Constantinople.¹¹³ Among the successors of Candidianus there was one who enjoyed both papal and imperial favor to a high degree. This was the Roman notary and subdeacon Primogenius, who was elected in 628 under the auspices of the Pope, after a disturbance following the forcible occupation of Grado by the schismatic Fortunatus. Primogenius is said to have taken the relics of Hermagoras, Felix, and Fortunatus back to Grado¹¹⁴ and to have received the stone cathedra of St. Mark as a gift from Heraclius,¹¹⁵ a clear proof that the Greek Empire favored Grado as against Aquileia, whose schismatic bishop resided in Cormons. Thus matters stood until Aquileia made its peace with Rome by returning to orthodoxy in about 700. A few years later, in 716, Rome formally recognized Aquileia, too, as a patriarchate and divided the original diocese between Grado and Aquileia. Thus there were, at the beginning of the eighth century, two patriarchates, both orthodox and both recognized by Rome. The patriarch of Grado was still regarded as the successor of St. Hermagoras and, through him, of St. Mark, and Aquileia seems to have acquiesced. This precarious situation was, however, possible, and even to a certain extent justified, only as long as the political frontiers between the Byzantine province and Longobard territory coincided with the metropolitan boundaries.¹¹⁶ This equilibrium was upset at the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century, when the northern Adriatic became a pawn in the political game between the new Frankish power and the Byzantine Empire. The diocese of Grado was torn asunder politically, the coastal districts being Greek and Istria Frankish. The Aquileian patriarchate, favored by the Franks, began to plot first for the inclusion of Istria in its metropolitan diocese, and then for the

¹¹³ Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, III/1, p. 1 ff., with bibliography; L. Duchesne, *L'église*, p. 458 ff.

¹¹⁴ *Cronica de singulis Patriarchis*, ed. G. Monticolo, "Cronache," p. 10.

¹¹⁵ See *supra*, note 27.

¹¹⁶ Difficulties began to develop as early as 723, when Serenus of Aquileia attempted to arrogate certain of Grado's rights of jurisdiction. Donatus of Grado appealed to Pope Gregory II who admonished both patriarchs to keep their peace. See A. Monteverde, "Il concilio," p. 2.

re-establishment of the original metropolitan jurisdiction of Aquileia to its full extent.¹¹⁷

It was in 826 that Maxentius of Aquileia finally came forward with his far-reaching claims which aimed at the complete annihilation of Grado. He could expect the full backing of the Western emperors (indeed, it was from this time onwards that the patriarchs of Aquileia became the pioneers of the Holy Roman Empire) and he could also count, to a certain extent, on the subservience of Rome. Grado, on the other hand, could expect no effective support from the Eastern Empire.

Thus, Maxentius of Aquileia could hope for an easy victory. On his appeal to Rome, a council was convened at Mantua in 827.¹¹⁸ Aquileia stated its "brief," namely, that Grado was only a parish (*plebs*) of Aquileia, and that the transfer of the patriarchal see to Grado had been a temporary measure which had never been formally and legally effected. Aquileia further insisted that the partition of the original territory of its patriarchate had been perpetrated by Grado *contra canonum statuta*, when the "heretic" Candidianus was elected successor to Venerius, whereas the Church of Aquileia had always been faithful to Rome and even her *vicaria in omnibus*. Thus, the Aquileian Church which stemmed, it was alleged, from St. Hermagoras, St. Mark,¹¹⁹ and St. Peter, had to be regarded as the first and foremost Church of all Italy, with the exception of Rome.

It is astonishing that Grado put up hardly any defense. Neither the Patriarch himself nor his suffragan bishops appeared. Grado's representative, the deacon Tiberius, did not arrive until five days after the opening of the Council. He was severely handicapped by the lack of records and documents, and did not even attempt to point out or correct the mistakes and falsifications of the Aquileians, such as the allegedly continuous orthodoxy of the Aquileian Church. Thus, Mantua was, theoretically, an unmitigated defeat for Grado.

But only theoretically. For Grado found an ally in the rising power of Venice. The leaders of the republic who were just then laying the foundations of their independence, became alarmed at the idea that their own Church had to submit henceforth to the authority of a "Frankish" prelate. They acted swiftly and decisively. By the translation of the relics of St. Mark himself from Alexandria to Venice in the following year (828/29) they undermined, as it were, the very foundations of Aquileia's rights. Aquileia might boast of its foundation by the Evangelist, a claim which the Venetians did nothing to destroy; on the contrary, they supported it because it happened to be an integral part of their own myth, but they went even further by becoming the *beati possidentes* of the authentic relics. In some respects the attitude of Venice was that of a *tertius gaudens*: the *translatio* not only worked against Aquileia

¹¹⁷ P. F. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig," p. 52ff., W. Lenel, "Studien," p. 7ff.

¹¹⁸ The acts of the council in G. D. Mansi, *op. cit.*, XIV, p. 494ff. and MGH, *Concilia*, II/2, p. 14. See also: G. Capelletti, *Storia*, I, p. 83f.; R. Cessi, "Nova Aquileja" p. 547ff.; R. Egger, "Hermagoras," p. 235f.; W. Lenel, *op. cit.*, p. 18; A. Monteverde, *op. cit.*; D. Tassini, *La questione*, p. 45.

¹¹⁹ The foundation of the church of Aquileia by St. Mark was, of course, conceded by the representative of Grado, who declared at the Council: *Negare non possum quin ego et paene omnes sciunt Aquileiam civitatem primam et metropolim esse et a beato Marco et Hermagora in Christi fidem fundatam* (R. Egger, *op. cit.*, p. 235).

but also brought Grado to heel, besides playing its part in the secession from Byzantium. In addition, the depositing of the Saint's relics in Venice itself conformed to the idea, widespread at the time, that possession of the relics of a patron saint entailed, in a way, the power over his city. From this point of view, the relics could not be suffered to fall into the hands of others.

The action of Venice, which must have been felt as a heavy blow in Aquileia, put some heart into the defense of Grado. Its patriarch launched a protest against the findings of the Mantuan synod in the *Rhythmus de Aquileia numquam restauranda*, in which Johannes, the former patriarch of Aquileia, was branded as *haereticus*. It is possible that soon after 827 the groundwork of the first "Grado Theory" was elaborated, a system of statements, forgeries and falsifications with which Grado attempted to prove its legal descent from the original Aquileian patriarchate and the recognition of this descent by the Roman Curia prior to the re-establishment of orthodoxy in Aquileia.

More important, however, than theories, were the political facts and the actual help of Venice. It was, to begin with, not feasible to re-establish the "original diocese of Aquileia" in view of the fact that its boundaries would have cut right across the actual political frontiers. Venetian influence was, in addition, too powerful a factor with the Roman Curia to allow the decisions of Mantua to be put into effect. It is true that from the middle of the ninth century onwards, the island patriarchate lost its Aquileian title; its metropolitan was henceforward styled *Patriarcha Gradensis*. But this change of title may not have been unwelcome to the Venetians since it opened up the possibility of the evolution of a national Venetian Church. In any case, the prelates of Grado continued to receive the pallium, and their authority was not challenged by Rome. Attacks came, however, from Aquileia herself, whose patriarchs believed themselves entitled by the decisions of Mantua to eliminate their annoying competitors. They invaded Grado in 880 and again in 944, only to be repulsed by Venetian troops. Soon after the middle of the tenth century a *modus vivendi* was found between the rival patriarchates, once more under the pressure of Venice, whose reigning family, the Candiani, were on excellent terms with Otto I and Otto II. At the synod of 967 the patriarchate of Grado was fully acknowledged as the metropolitan see of Venetia and Istria by the Pope, the Emperor, and the patriarch of Aquileia, a recognition that was renewed at the beginning of the eleventh century by Popes Sylvester II and Sergius IV.

Thus matters stood between the rival patriarchates when the mighty and violent Poppo ascended the patriarchal throne of Aquileia in 1019 and revived the dormant struggle. Making use of a political crisis in Venice, he occupied, plundered and destroyed Grado in 1024, carrying away all the relics he could find. Rome took no firm stand. At first it ceded to Poppo the rights of Grado, but a synod held in the Lateran in December 1024 revoked this decision and ordered the restitution of all looted treasure to Grado. It was again Venetian influence that brought about the re-establishment of Grado's rights. The question was not, however, settled once and for all in 1024. The problem of

metropolitan rights over the Istrian episcopate was not even touched upon, and enough loopholes were left for Poppo to renew the strife. Three years later, in 1027, another synod was held in the Lateran which completely reversed the decisions of 1024. Poppo, who claimed that he desired only to put into effect the verdict of Mantua (827), achieved a full victory, being invested with the *plebs* of Grado, which was to cease henceforth to be a patriarchate or even a bishopric.

This would have meant the final catastrophe of the ecclesiastical policy of Venice, perhaps even the end of the Venetian Church. But Grado—Venice repeated their policy of two hundred years before. Patriarch Orso of Grado did not even appear at the synod, and Venice kept Grado occupied. An attempt on Poppo's part to take Grado by force proved abortive, and even Emperor Conrad II could not break the resistance of the Venetians. In 1044 Poppo made another attack. He succeeded in taking Grado but died immediately afterwards. Since Conrad II, the most energetic upholder of Poppo's claims, had died five years before, the way was cleared for a Venetian counter-offensive that ended with a full triumph for Venice—Grado. Also in 1044, a Venetian embassy appeared in Rome with the result that a synod was convened whose decisions meant a complete reversal of those of 1027. The new verdict is summed up in a privilege of Benedict IX¹²⁰ of April 1044, in which Grado was recognized as the see of the true patriarchate, as *Nova Aquileia*, whereas the former patriarch of Aquileia was termed *praesul Foroiuliensis*, bishop of Friuli. In 1053 Leo IX gave to the patriarch of Grado another privilege,¹²¹ later called the "Constitutions of Leo IX," which may be regarded as the Magna Charta of Grado. *Nova Aquileia* (Grado) was expressly recognized as the *caput et metropolis totius Venetiae et Istriae*, the only legitimate successor of old Aquileia and its first bishops, St. Mark and St. Hermagoras. To the patriarch of Grado were due the honors and rights of the second oldest Church of Italy.

In view of this solemn recognition by the Pope, it did not really matter that Dominicus, *dei gratia Gradensis et Aquileiensis ecclesiae Patriarcha*, received a severe rebuff from Patriarch Peter of Antioch to whom he had sent a rather condescending letter.¹²² Much more serious was the fact that "Old Aquileia" did not give up its metropolitan rights in Istria. Even the Roman Curia itself had to reckon with this *de facto* situation¹²³ which lasted through the greater part of the twelfth century. In Dalmatia, however, Grado scored considerable successes, thanks to the political and economic expansion of Venice in that region. From 1154/55 onwards the patriarch of Grado could call himself primate of Dalmatia.¹²⁴ Otherwise, there continued a stalemate, enlivened by warlike altercations, as when in 1164 Udalric of Aquileia attacked Grado, but was captured and only freed in return for an annual tribute.¹²⁵ But neither of the

¹²⁰ P. F. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig," p. 95, with sources.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 97.

¹²² *Ibid.*, p. 98.

¹²³ W. Lenel, "Studien," p. 96f., with sources and bibliography (privileges of Innocent II and Alexander II in favor of the secular possessions of Aquileia in Istria); H. Schmidinger, "Patriarch."

¹²⁴ P. F. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig," p. 134f.; in 1182 (*ibid.*, p. 138f.) the offensive term *primatus* was altered to *prioratus* as a concession to the Dalmatian bishops.

¹²⁵ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 251, 466; *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 288.

two parties could decide the issue for itself. Finally, in 1180, the patriarch of Grado accepted the situation and concluded, under the auspices of Venice, the Emperor and Rome, a treaty with Aquileia in which the *status quo* was recognized. Grado renounced its claim to the metropolitan rights over the Istrian bishoprics.¹²⁶

With the compromise of 1180, which certainly favored Aquileia more than Grado, the age-old quarrel between the two rival patriarchates came officially to an end. It is, at first glance, surprising that Venice, which held most of the trumps, should have given in. The truth is that the quarrel had become relatively unimportant for the republic. Her influence in Istria and Dalmatia had been secured by military and economic means. The organization of her national Church was completed; since 1156 the patriarch of Grado had resided in Venice, and even the rival patriarch of Aquileia had come into the orbit of Venetian influence. Since 1177 the latter, too, had accommodation in the city, as well as the use of the church of San Giorgio (probably the later San Giorgio dei Greci). Above all, the foundations of the city-state's own national and religious myth had been laid, and although the elaborate superstructure was not completed until much later, the foundations themselves were already firmly anchored in the consciousness of the people and its political and ecclesiastic rulers.

This myth was, indeed, the outcome of the long-drawn struggle with Aquileia, and the first stage of its development was the work of Aquileia itself. It was from Aquileia that the legend of the foundation of the North Adriatic Church by St. Mark was taken over, first by Grado, then by Venice. The next step, which was made by Grado, was the fabrication of the story that the transfer of the patriarchate from Aquileia to Grado had been legally and definitively effected by a synod held in Grado under the "Patriarch" Helias (or Elias). This is the main subject of the so-called first "Grado Theory," which has left traces in the official historiography of Venice.¹²⁷ The theory itself is an elaborate piece of forgery, which has been variously attributed to dates ranging from the ninth to the beginning of the eleventh century.¹²⁸ It certainly existed by the end of the tenth century and may well have had earlier antecedents.

¹²⁶ B. M. de Rubeis, *op. cit.*, p. 619; F. Ughelli, *op. cit.*, V, p. 1129; P. F. Kehr, *op. cit.*, p. 134; W. Lenel, *op. cit.*, p. 97; D. Tassini, *La questione*, p. 86. The relevant passage of the declaration signed by Henricus Dandolo of Grado is this: *Renuntio omni iuri acquisito et acquirendo, et omnibus actionibus, tam in rem, quam in personam acquisitis et acquirendis, quos et quas habeo nomine meo et Gradensis ecclesiae, vel habere possum ego vel successores mei in futurum, adversum Uldericum, et eius ecclesiam super episcopatibus Istriae et super thesauris, quos Poppo Aquileiensis patriarcha de Gradu asportavit et super possessiones, quas Gradensis ecclesia habuit in Mursiano et in territorio Aquileiensi . . .*

¹²⁷ The sources from which the growth of the "Grado Theory" is to be reconstructed are indicated in W. Lenel, *op. cit.*, p. 23 ff., who has, furthermore (*ibid.*, p. 88), attempted to demonstrate the various stages of the Grado forgeries by means of "genealogical tables." These have been brought up to date by R. Cessi, *op. cit.*, p. 583.

¹²⁸ According to W. Lenel, *op. cit.*, p. 63 ff., the first Grado theory, which did not contain any claims to the Istrian bishoprics, originated between ca. 950 and 1008, probably before the year 1000, under Patriarch Vitale IV Candiano; the second theory, comprising the Istrian claims, was propounded shortly after 1000. The latter is also the opinion of R. Cessi (*op. cit.*, p. 555) who, however, dates the first theory in the ninth century, and of P. F. Kehr (*op. cit.*, p. 17 f.). The Istrian claims were, at any rate, still upheld at the time of the Roman synod of 1024, whereas the last touches to the Grado forgeries were added only in the twelfth century (W. Meyer, "Spaltung," p. 26 f.).

This first theory does not yet contain anything about the Istrian claims of Aquileia; it speaks only of the dignity of the patriarchate, the legitimate succession of Grado, and its jurisdiction over the bishoprics of the lagoon. Its main exhibits are the spurious acts of the Grado synod mentioned above, partly interpolated, partly forged on the basis of an alleged letter or privilege addressed by Pope Pelagius II to Bishop Helias of Grado (572-586/8).¹²⁹ The genuine letters of Pope Pelagius II to Helias have quite a different tenor from the forged document; in them the Pope admonishes the Grado bishop to abstain from his schismatic tenets.¹³⁰ The earliest form of the forged letter contains the following passage which became the nucleus of all later forgeries, and which is even to be found, in an abridged form and with interpolations, in a mosaic inscription in San Marco: *Igitur quia petistis a nobis per missa tuae venerandae fraternitatis brevia, consentientibus in eis suffraganeis tibi episcopis, quatenus Gradense castrum totius Venetiae fieri metropolim . . . per huius praecepti seriem suprascriptum castrum Gradense totius Venetiae fieri . . . metropolim confirmamus.*

To this statement the *Chronicon Gradense*,¹³¹ among other chronicles, adds the fictitious account of the foundation of the six Venetian bishoprics by Helias. Thus, in the national myth of Venice, Helias became the founder of the Venetian national Church, a status underlined by his representation in the mosaics of San Marco; this honor could not have been bestowed more inappropriately in view of the fact that Helias was a schismatic.

The next layer of forgeries, constituting the so-called "second Grado Theory" is nothing but an amplification of the first. Its purpose was to include the claim to jurisdiction over the Istrian bishoprics in the existing system of forgeries. To this end only two words (*et Istriae*) had to be interpolated in a number of documents, both forged and genuine, among them the famous Pelagius letter.¹³² This second batch of forgeries, with the claim that Grado had, since the sixth century, been recognized as "*totius Venetiae et Istriae caput et metropolis*," must have existed in 1053 because it served as the foundation of the Venetian demands successfully presented at the Roman synod of that year. On the other hand, the final version of these forgeries cannot go back to a time before the eleventh century, a fact that is conclusively proved by one of the key "documents," an alleged privilege of Pope Benedict I (574-78) which contains a list of sixteen bishoprics. This list is datable since it corresponds exactly to the actual organization of the metropolitan diocese in the eleventh century.¹³³ The likeliest date of the final version of the second theory is therefore between the two synods of 1044 and 1053.¹³⁴

¹²⁹ On the Grado synod see: B. M. De Rubeis, *op. cit.*, p. 91; P. Paschini, "Vicende . . . a Carlo Magno," p. 235; the *Acta synodus Gradensis* analyzed by R. Cessi, *op. cit.*, p. 588, and D. Tassini, *op. cit.*, p. 29. The forged Pelagius letter has found its way into several early chronicles of Venice: G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff., 48 ff.; R. Cessi, *op. cit.*, p. 588. See also P. F. Kehr, *op. cit.*, p. 20 f. with sources.

¹³⁰ The genuine letters of Pope Pelagius in Migne, *PL*, LXXII, pp. 706, 710, 715.

¹³¹ G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 42 ff.; P. F. Kehr, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

¹³² R. Cessi, *op. cit.*, pp. 555, 558 ff.; W. Lenel, *op. cit.*, p. 72 ff.; H. Schmidinger, *op. cit.* pp. 47 ff., 145 ff.

¹³³ P. F. Kehr, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 ff., 17 f.

¹³⁴ R. Cessi, *Storia*, p. 102 f.

Not even with the widening of the claims of Grado to include Istria was the work of the forgers of Grado and Venice completed. There was yet a third step which, like the first and the second, has left its traces in the mosaic decoration of San Marco. This third and last phase of the Grado forgeries concerned Dalmatia.¹³⁵ It is an exact parallel to the second, both in purpose and method. The claims of Grado to ecclesiastic jurisdiction were now made to include Dalmatia, and, by interpolations in genuine and forged documents, construed to date from the sixth century—against all historical truth or probability. Actually, the political aspirations of Venice to the domination of Dalmatia, or part of it,¹³⁶ did not antedate the famous expedition in 1000 of Pietro II Orseolo. And although the doge added soon afterwards the *Ducatus Dalmatiae* to his Venetian title, Dalmatia itself was, until the end of the eleventh century, regarded as a province of the Byzantine Empire. Not until the middle of the twelfth century did Venice attempt to bring about a new ecclesiastic organization, first by the exemption of the bishoprics of Veglia, Arbe, and Ossuero from the metropolitan jurisdiction of Spalato, then, in 1155, by the subordination of these bishoprics and of the newly founded archbishopric of Zara to the patriarchate of Grado.¹³⁷ The Patriarch Enrico Dandolo, an uncle of the doge of the same name, whose influence with the Pope was, perhaps, the most important factor in this achievement, received the title of Primate of Dalmatia.¹³⁸ But even after that, parts of Dalmatia were still disputed between Venice, Byzantium (which staged a comeback in southern Dalmatia between 1165 and 1171), Hungary, and the Normans; only the Fourth Crusade re-established Venetian domination.

It is not known when the forgeries that were meant to assist the Venetian claims to the political and ecclesiastic domination of Dalmatia were perpetrated. Certain literary formulations of the Venetian theory appeared only *post festum*, in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, but the nucleus must have been formed earlier. The likeliest date for it were the decades preceding the settlement of 1155, or the following period until the end of the twelfth century, when Venice had to fight hard to retain her dominions. Like all Venetian forgeries, the Dalmatian claim is to be found in practically all the later chronicles and state histories; but the most interesting version, and perhaps the earliest that has come down to us, is contained in the inscriptions of two mosaic figures in San Marco. In an arch which opens from the left-hand chapel (the Cappella San Pietro) into the main presbytery, two figures are represented, Helias, the Patriarch of Grado, and Pope Pelagius II. The inscription above the head of Helias reads: *Metropolim rogito, Pater, esse Gradum Venetorum*. The answering verse appears above the head of the Pope: *Sit Venetis Istris*

¹³⁵ As far as I am aware, this third phase of the Grado forgeries has never been studied adequately.

¹³⁶ The Dalmatian question is summarized in W. Lenel, *Die Entstehung*, p. 11 ff., and G. Praga, *Storia*, I.

¹³⁷ W. Lenel, *op. cit.*, p. 24 f., with a quotation of a passage from Dandolo's chronicle not contained in Muratori's edition (to be inserted in *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 287 B, after the words: *signum in luna apparuit*).

¹³⁸ Later (1182) altered to *Prioratus*. See *supra*, note 124, and H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, p. 244; R. Cessi, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

populis et Dalmaticorum. In addition to this brief statement, there is an inscription held by the Pope, that reads as follows: *Quia iustis petitionibus tuis, venerande frater, contradicere nequimus, per nostri privilegii seriem confirmamus Gradense castrum metropolim totius Venetiae Histriae atque Dalmatiae*. This inscription is a transcript of the most important passage of the forged letter or privilege of Pelagius¹³⁹ and differs from the first Pelagian forgery only by the insertion of the words *Histriae atque Dalmatiae*. Thus the inscription combines all three stages of the Grado theory. It is the most complete and at the same time the most succinct statement of the ecclesiastical claims of Venice — Grado.

It would be wrong to assume that those Venetian claims which went beyond the settlement of 1180 were quietly dropped after that crucial date. This was not the case. Even the Istrian claim which was expressly renounced in the *pactum*, was theoretically upheld. It was incorporated into the *Liber pactorum primus* of the republic,¹⁴⁰ and it figures prominently in Dandolo's official *Chronicon*, as late as the fourteenth century.¹⁴¹ It is true, that from the late twelfth century on, there were, concurrent with the reiteration of the fabricated claims, attempts to explain the existence of the two patriarchates in a conciliatory way. Joachim of Floris, who knew the whole story first hand, even went to the trouble of thinking up an Old Testament "prototype" for Grado and Aquileia, which he found in the two sons of Judah and Thamar, Zara and Phares, *quorum prior Gradensem, alter Aquileiensem significat*. This, too, was quoted by Dandolo,¹⁴² whose chronicle is, indeed, the reservoir into which all earlier traditions flowed. But the accent is, even with Joachim and Dandolo, on the Venetian claims (*prior Gradensem*), partly because these claims had become part and parcel of the local myth and the national history of Venice, partly also because of the ever-recurring quarrels with Aquileia, especially with regard to Istria. Occasions for the Venetians to regret the concessions of 1180 were furnished abundantly by the Aquileian Patriarchs Wolfger (1204-1218) and Berthold (1218-1251). For instance, in 1209 the temporal dominion over Istria was restituted to Aquileia. Again in 1220 and 1238, Berthold's feudal rights to the Istrian possessions were upheld and confirmed by Frederick II, although these territories had, in the meantime, fallen into the hands of the Venetians.¹⁴³

Thus the quarrel which had begun with the double election of 607 smouldered on to the middle of the thirteenth century. But long before that time Venice had achieved in principle what it had set out to do: first, to support Aquileia's own claims to apostolic foundation; second, to assist Grado's claims to being the

¹³⁹ Quoted *supra*, p. 38.

¹⁴⁰ W. Lenel, *Die Entstehung*, p. 10, dates the *Liber pactorum* in the thirteenth century; P. F. Kehr, *op. cit.*, p. 14, in the fourteenth.

¹⁴¹ *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 98 f.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, col. 103: *Quod autem duo e Petro Christi Vicario Patriarchatus orti sunt, illud causa est, quod Judae filio Jacob orti sunt duo filii ex Thamar, Zara et Phares, quorum prior Gradensem, alter Aquileiensem significat, ut sub Prioratus ordinem ad hoc materia sit divisa. Unde qua ipsa Mater Ecclesia typum Coelestis tenet in Terris, quasi Vicos et Plateas, duos ipsos Patriarchatus, quasi duos ordines in semetipsa reservat.*

¹⁴³ G. Marchetti-Longhi, "Il patriarcato," p. 33 ff.; D. Tassini, *op. cit.*, p. 98. W. Lenel "Studien," pp. 130 f., 135 ff.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, p. 50 f.

legitimate successor of Aquileia; third, to usurp Grado's claims by acquiring the relics of St. Mark; and finally, to connect Venice itself with the mythical founder of the patriarchate by the fabrication of the *praedestinatio* legend in the thirteenth century. The most difficult part of this process was the struggle against Aquileia, especially since the latter was assisted throughout by the Holy Roman Empire. But with Grado, too, not all was plain sailing. The first difficulties arose when, in 798, Patriarch Johannes of Grado refused to ordain a sixteen-year-old youth as bishop of Olivolo-Castello, and favored the Frankish party as against that of the Doge. Mauricius, the son of the reigning Doge Johannes, took Grado by force and had the Patriarch killed (802).¹⁴⁴ The quarrel was a purely political one between the Frankish and the Greek party. It had nothing to do with the principles of ecclesiastic policy, but it may have contributed to the decision of Venice, made in 829, not to hand over the newly acquired relics of St. Mark to Grado, but to keep them in Rialto and build a martyrion over them. In any case, it was the first step in the long-term policy of Venice to keep a firm hold over the patriarch and, perhaps, to force him sooner or later to follow the relics of the Patron Saint to Rialto. In this, as in other aspects of the policy of the Venetian state towards its own patriarchs, the example of Byzantium may have played its part.¹⁴⁵

That the decision of Venice was a wise one became patent about fifty years later, in the serious controversy of 872-882.¹⁴⁶ The *dramatis personae* of the struggle were Doge Ursus Partecipacus (Partecipacius) and Patriarch Marturio of Grado; the immediate cause was the ordination of an abbot. This was, in itself, not very important, but it furnished an opportunity for the dogate to impose its will on the Patriarch and thus to lay the foundations of a state Church. The Venetian bishops were on the Doge's side, Pope John VIII on the Patriarch's. The litigation ended with a compromise, but the Patriarch and Rome were the losers. The Pope gave in, even to the extent of calling the Venetian Church, in one of his letters to the Doge, *ecclesia tua*. Thus the first real crisis ended with a full victory for Venice, at least in principle. It was a logical consequence of this first test that the patriarch was, from the second half of the eleventh century onwards, quite often called *Patriarcha Venetus*.¹⁴⁷ As such, and not as metropolitan bishop of Grado, he received from the doge in 1107 the church of St. Akyndan (Akyndinos) in Constantinople with all its appurtenances.¹⁴⁸ From the beginning of the eleventh century onwards, the patriarch had living quarters in Venice at San Silvestro, at first temporarily, and from the middle of the twelfth century onwards, permanently. In 1156 he was even granted a piece of ground for the building of a palace.¹⁴⁹ Several churches in Venice were placed under his jurisdiction.¹⁵⁰ The absorption of the

¹⁴⁴ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 53 ff.

¹⁴⁵ A. F. Gfroerer, *Geschichte*, I, p. 161; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 65.

¹⁴⁶ P. F. Kehr, "Rom and Venedig," p. 60 ff.

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 105, 144.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

¹⁴⁹ G. B. Gallicciolli, *Memorie*, IV, p. 39 ff.

¹⁵⁰ Listed, *ibid.*, p. 45.

patriarchate by Venice was made easier by the fact that from the second quarter of the ninth century until 1272 all patriarchs of Grado were Venetians.¹⁵¹

Thus it seems curious, at least at first glance, that the republic did very little towards securing for the patriarchs the financial means necessary for an appropriate style of living. The curia had to intervene several times (e.g., in the seventies of the eleventh century, in 1112, 1178, and 1256)¹⁵² but without much effect. It is also on record that the curia met with repeated refusals in its various attempts to transfer the patriarchate from Grado to Venice, that is, to make the Grado patriarchate a Venetian one, and to suppress the episcopate of Olivolo-Castello. This suggestion was first made in 1112 and repeated several times, e.g., in 1178.¹⁵³ One of the motives of the curia in advocating the transfer was the ever-recurring quarrels and litigations between the patriarchs and the bishops of Olivolo-Castello brought about by the anomaly that the bishop of Olivolo-Castello held jurisdiction over the Realtine churches, including some of those in which the patriarch officiated, though not San Marco. It was only in 1299 that a *modus vivendi* was found for the co-existence of the two authorities in the city by the exemption of the patriarchal residence from episcopal jurisdiction.¹⁵⁴

This attitude of the Venetians towards their own patriarchate, for whose claims they had fought so stubbornly against Aquileia, the curia, and the Roman Empire, was not, however, lacking in consistency. It is true that some part of the unwillingness to transform the Grado patriarchate into a Venetian one was due to family policies and family quarrels within the Venetian aristocracy from which the doges, the patriarchs, and the bishops of Olivolo were recruited. But the main causes have to be sought deep in Venetian policy. The transformation of the Grado patriarchate into a Venetian one would have meant the loss of the former's inherited claims and of some of its historical prestige as an apostolic foundation. It would also have given too much power to the patriarch himself, who might have turned from a convenient and more or less dependent figurehead of the Venetian State Church into an ecclesiastic ruler of that Church. To avoid this danger the Venetians preferred keeping the patriarch in comparative poverty and dependence.

In the forties of the twelfth century this policy led to a crisis, the severest in the history of the Venetian Church.¹⁵⁵ The quarrel, whose protagonists were Doge Pietro Polani and the Patriarch Enrico Dandolo, was certainly intensified by dynastic politics—the Dandoli and Badoer were aligned against the Polani and Michiel—and it also had some aspects bearing on the question of investiture. But it was, fundamentally, a fight between the Doge as the head of the state and the Patriarch aspiring to the independent leadership of the state Church. The Patriarch had to go into exile in 1148. Under Doge Polani's successor,

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 52.

¹⁵² P. F. Kehr, "Rom und Venedig," pp. 106, 118, 140.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 129, 140.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 140.

¹⁵⁵ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 246 f.; H. Simonsfeld, "Kurze Venezianer Annalen," p. 407 f.; M. Sanudo, *Vite dei dogi*, ed. G. Monticolo, p. 218; P. F. Kehr, *op. cit.*, p. 131 ff.; R. Cessi, *Storia*, p. 151 f.

Domenico Morosini, a compromise was reached in which the rights of the state were safeguarded.

As soon as this was achieved, the patriarchs were no longer excluded from the state church of San Marco. They seem to have had their place opposite that of the doge, on the north side of the presbytery. The place of the patriarch's seat is to this day marked by the mosaics referred to above, which contain special allusions to the official version of the history of the national patriarchate. It is possible that the placing of the patriarch's chair opposite that of the doge was suggested by Sicilian models.¹⁵⁶ Like the Sicilian Church, the Venetian Church had become a state Church and a national Church.

The crisis of 1148 was the last attempt of the patriarchate to free itself from its dependence on the doge and the state. From Enrico's death in 1188 onwards, the patriarchs of Grado were more or less willing tools of the state. Three centuries after this crisis the republic gave up its resistance to the transfer of the patriarchate. In 1451 it was transferred to Castello and, finally, in 1807, to San Marco.

This final measure did not entail any drastic changes in San Marco. The patriarch simply took the place of the primicerius or, rather, that above him in the hierarchy of the Church. His throne faced the main presbytery, dedicated to Christ and St. Mark, while behind it was the chapel of St. Peter and opposite the chapel of St. Clement. The two dedications, to St. Peter and St. Clement, are well attested for the eleventh century.¹⁵⁷

The altars of the church, only five of which can be dated as far back as the thirteenth century or earlier, mirror the character of San Marco as a national church. The main altar was dedicated to the Patron of the Republic, St. Mark; those of the choir chapels were dedicated to St. Peter and St. Clement, and those of the transepts to St. John the Evangelist and St. Leonard. Later additions and changes have blurred the original character of the altar-plan. In the thirteenth century St. Anthony the Abbot was added to St. Leonard as patron of the south altar; in 1618 the same altar became the Shrine of the Miraculous Relics of the True Cross, and is now the altar of the Holy Sacrament. The corresponding altar in the north transept received the image of the Nicopeia in 1617 and was dedicated to the Virgin. Altars which were added later include those of the Crocefisso or "Capitello" in 1290, of St. Isidore in 1355, of the Madonna dei Mascoli in 1430, of St. Paul in 1462, and of St. James in 1471.

In the crypt there were, according to a description of 1308, altars of the Virgin (since 1222), of St. Theodore, and of the four Aquileian Virgins. It would be interesting to know whether any of these altars go back to a time prior to the thirteenth century. Perhaps, St. Theodore, the first patron of Venice, found a refuge here in the crypt when he was ousted from the church proper by St. Mark.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ See *infra*, p. 48.

¹⁵⁷ For the foregoing see: A. Battistella, "La politica"; A. Galante, "Per la storia," p. 297. It is doubtful whether the dedication of the doge's chapel to St. Clement had anything to do with the imperial Anti-Pope Clement (III), formerly Archbishop of Ravenna, who was elected at the instigation of Henry IV in 1080.

¹⁵⁸ References to the altars of San Marco are to be found in all the older monographs on the church (F. Sansovino, *Venetia*; G. Meschinello, *La chiesa ducale*, etc.); the altars of the crypt are mentioned in the description by Donadio of 1308, printed in *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 238, no. 2.

VI. ST. MARK AND THE DOGE

The transfer of the patriarchate to San Marco marked the last stage of a long development and the end of the church as the ducal chapel of Venice. Indeed, the original purpose of San Marco had been to serve as the *Capella Ducale*.¹⁵⁹ San Marco was not, however, the first ducal chapel of Rialto; it was preceded in this respect by S. Teodoro, built or rebuilt, in 819.¹⁶⁰ In a document of that year, the doge refers to this chapel as *Capella nostra*.¹⁶¹ The same title was given to San Marco in the donation deed of San Giorgio by Doge Tribunus Menius in 979.¹⁶² The Doge styled himself *patronus et verus gubernator ecclesiae et capellae Sancti Marci*.¹⁶³ Even after the rebuilding of the church on a grander scale at the end of the eleventh century, San Marco remained primarily the private chapel of the doge. He nominated and invested, without the approval of the patriarch or the bishop of Castello, the highest ecclesiastic of the church, the primicerius.¹⁶⁴ This dignitary was subject only to the jurisdiction of the doge, who, from the twelfth century onwards, undertook in a *promissio*, signed at his own election, to nominate for this post only members of indigenous noble families. It was in vain that the bishops of Castello attempted, in 1230 and again in 1367, to bring the primicerius under their jurisdiction. Even the curia upheld the independent position of the first prelate of San Marco and in 1251 permitted him to use, on certain occasions, the mitre, ring, and staff. The primiceriate lasted until 1810, only a few years after the lapse of the dogate.

Originally, there was no parish attached to San Marco, although the churches of S. Geminiano (SS. Geminiano e Mena), S. Giuliano, and S. Basso (originally S. Saba) were incorporated into it as filial churches, just as were all the churches dedicated to St. Mark in the Venetian colonies of the Mediterranean, in Constantinople, Tyre, Acre, Berytus, Candia, Palermo, and Durazzo.¹⁶⁵ The non-

¹⁵⁹ On the ecclesiastic character and the position of San Marco as ducal chapel see: *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 19 ff., with bibliography on p. 20; *Documenti*, nos. 1, 3, 6, 11, 12, 19. F. Corner, *Ecclesiae Venetae*, IX and X; G. Meschinello, *op. cit.*, *passim*; G. Lonigo, *Sul patronato*; C. Neumann, "Die Markuskirche," pp. 612 ff., 737 ff.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 153 ff.; A. Galante, *op. cit.*, p. 283 ff. On the clergy of San Marco see also A. Meschinello, *op. cit.*, III/2, pp. 1-37.

¹⁶⁰ See *supra*, notes 70-73 and H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 65.

¹⁶¹ A. Gloria, *Codice*, I, p. 65.

¹⁶² *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, pp. 20, 52; F. Ughelli, *Italia sacra*, ed. N. Coleti, V, p. 1200. The relevant passage of the document of 979 reads: *Basilica Sci Marci quae est capella nostra, libera a servitute matris ecclesiae*.

¹⁶³ This is the formula used in the act of investing the primicerius. *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 20 f.; *Venezia e le sue lagune*, p. 273.

¹⁶⁴ *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 51 ff.; A. Ughelli, *op. cit.*, p. 1329 ff.; F. Corner, *op. cit.*, X, p. 179, and XVIII, p. 274; C. Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 613; A. Galante, *op. cit.*, p. 290. Before the foundation of San Marco, the primicerius, as the chaplain of the doges, had his seat in S. Teodoro: see the document of 819 *supra*, n. 161. In a later period, the primicerius was elected by the canons of San Marco, but proposed and confirmed by the doge.

¹⁶⁵ The church of San Marco in Palermo was established, through the adaptation of an earlier Greek church, by Pietro Polani in 1140 (H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 232); its privileges were confirmed in 1195 by Henry VI. In 1166 Pope Alexander III confirmed to Leonardo Fradello, Procurator of St. Mark's, *interventu ducis, ecclesias Sci Marci Tyrensis et Acon et omnia alia bona in Hierosolymitano regno per quoscumque operae Sci Marci de Venetiis olim concessas* (*ibid.*, col. 290). San Marco in Tyre attempted in 1201 to free itself from its allegiance to the Venetian mother church, but in vain. For other churches of St. Mark in the Levant, see H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 232, 267, 279. One of the earliest of these was the church of San Marco in Dyrhachium (Durazzo), mentioned in the *Translatio Sancti Nicolai* (*Recueil des historiens des Croisades*, V/1, p. 284) *ad annum* 1094.

existence of a parish of San Marco is quite consistent with its original and long-retained character as a private church, an "Eigenkirche" or "chiesa domenicale,"—an institution of the kind frequently encountered in the ninth century and possibly derived from the Longobards.¹⁶⁶ The already existing institution of the "Eigenkirche" in general and of the founders' privileges had been acknowledged by the Roman Synod of 826, a few years prior to the foundation of San Marco. The *pactum* of 1177 did not touch the doge's prerogatives; on the contrary, the doge received new privileges.¹⁶⁷

Besides being the *patronus et gubernator* of the church, the doge was also the chief keeper of the Saint's relics and the guarantor of their safety. In this capacity he was repeatedly represented in the mosaics of the church, at a time when the social and governmental organization of the republic forbade his representation as a ruler, or even as the head of the government. Two conflicting tendencies existed: on the one hand, the figure of the doge had to be included as an authenticating motif in pictures featuring the relics of St. Mark; on the other hand, the republic forbade the "ruler portrait." The solution of this conflict was the creation of the earliest official group-portrait in Venetian art, in which the doge, the commune, the clerics, and the *populus* appear united in one representation.

Being the ducal church par excellence, San Marco may be supposed to have been also the sepulchral church of the doges. This suggestion appears to be strengthened by the fact that the first church of San Marco was believed to have followed the model of the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The *Translatio Sancti Marci* contains a passage in which Johannes Partecipacius is said to have carried out the vow of his brother Justinian to build next to the Palace a church dedicated to St. Mark, *ad eam similitudinem quam supra Domini tumulum Hierosolymis viderat*. A similar sentence is found in the *Chronicon Altinate* where it is said of the mysterious "Narses" that he erected in honor of St. Mark a church *secundum exemplum quod ad Domini tumulum Jerosolimis viderat*.¹⁶⁸ The second passage is clearly copied from the first, and the tradition, which is not older than the tenth century at the earliest, is vitiated by the fact that the same model is claimed by the *Chronicon Altinate* for the church of S. Salvatore in Venice.¹⁶⁹ The *similitudo* may have concerned, if anything, the crypts of these churches. Deserving of more serious consideration is the connection of the first church of San Marco with the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, a connection that seems to be borne out by Forlati's excavations, which have established a cruciform plan for the first building of San Marco.¹⁷⁰ That the present San Marco, a building of the late eleventh century, is a copy of the Apostoleion, is well attested by both sources and architectural facts.¹⁷¹ Now, we know that the Mausoleum of Constantine the Great was an

¹⁶⁶ U. Stutz, *Die Eigenkirche*.

¹⁶⁷ A. Galante, *op. cit.*, pp. 288, 269f.

¹⁶⁸ H. Simonsfeld, *Venezianische Studien*, I, p. 49; *Translatio Sancti Marci*, *Acta Sanctorum*, *loc. cit.*, p. 353ff.

¹⁶⁹ H. Simonsfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 50, n. 1.

¹⁷⁰ F. Forlati, "Il primo San Marco."

¹⁷¹ See *infra*, book two.

appendage of the Apostoleion and that the church itself was for some time the favorite burial place of the Byzantine emperors in addition to its having been the Martyrium of the Apostles and Fathers of the Church, like John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus.¹⁷² What would, therefore, be more logical than to assume that San Marco inherited from its prototype this essential point in addition to so many other characteristics?

Actually, there are early graves in San Marco, although it is not possible to identify them,¹⁷³ and a number of ducal burials are, in fact, well attested or even still extant: those of Domenico Selvo (†1084), Vitale Falier (†1096), Vitale Michiel I (†1102), his wife Felicitas (†1111), Ordelafo Falier (†1118), Marino Morosini (†1253), Giovanni Soranzo (†1328), Bartolomeo Gradenigo (†1343), and Andrea Dandolo (†1354). On the strength of this evidence it cannot be said that San Marco was the sepulchral church of the doges par excellence or throughout its entire history, but the list of the burials is nevertheless suggestive. It embraces the entire series of doges from the accession of Domenico Selvo in 1071 to the death of Ordelafo Falier in 1118. Was the church then, in fact, the burial church of the doges of the late eleventh and the early twelfth century, perhaps in imitation of the Byzantine Apostoleion? This assumption is tempting in view of the fact that the Apostoleion must have gained a renewed and very powerful influence at the very time when it served as a prototype for the rebuilding of San Marco. Burial among the relics of the apostles had a great attraction after the initial example had been set by Constantine the Great. It was followed, for instance, in a symbolic way by Theodoric at Ravenna.¹⁷⁴ However, the series of ducal burials of the late eleventh and the early twelfth century in San Marco allows of another and more logical explanation, which has no direct connection with the Apostoleion. The doges from Domenico Selvo to Ordelafo Falier were the chief promoters of the rebuilding of San Marco, and it is very likely that they were buried in the church in commemoration, and as an acknowledgement, of their share in this great enterprise. This explanation holds equally true for Marino Morosini, under whose dogate, about the middle of the thirteenth century, the northern wing of the atrium seems to have been vaulted,¹⁷⁵ and for the three fourteenth-century doges who were responsible for building and decorating the Baptistery and the Cappella S. Isidoro.¹⁷⁶ As a matter of fact, the burials of the ducal patrons of the building and the

¹⁷² For a list of the imperial tombs in the Apostoleion see Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Caerimoniis*, II, 42, Bonn ed., I, p. 642; H. Doerries, "Das Selbstzeugnis," p. 417 ff. with bibliography.

¹⁷³ *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 194; M. E. Manfredi and L. Marangoni, *Le opere di restauro* (1908), pp. 24, 70, 80; M. Manfredi, *Le condizioni*, fig. on p. 79; P. Paoletti, *Nuovi ritocchi*, p. 12 f. On the burials and tombs of the doges in general see A. da Mosto, *I dogi*. On the graves of the first Partecipacii in the destroyed church of S. Ilario, see R. Cattaneo, *L'architettura*, p. 235 ff. Of the ducal burials in San Marco enumerated in the text only the monuments of Vitale Falier, Marino Morosini, Giovanni Soranzo, Bartolomeo Gradenigo, Andrea Dandolo, and that of Dogaressa Felicitas Michiel are preserved. The last of these and that of Vitale Falier, both placed in niches of the atrium, seem to have received their present shape in the thirteenth century, when the niches were closed with what appear to be earlier choir screens (*templa*), almost certainly taken from the side apses of the church. See O. Demus, "Zwei Dogengräber."

¹⁷⁴ A. M. Schneider, "Die Symbolik"; R. Heidenreich, *Das Grabmal*; H. Doerries, *op. cit.*, p. 413 ff.

¹⁷⁵ This has been pointed out by G. Gombosi, "Il portico," p. 163 ff.

¹⁷⁶ V. Lazzarini, "Il testamento." See also *infra*, p. 77.

decoration of the third church of San Marco constitute a complete series, with the exception of two ducal graves: that of Domenico Contarini (1042-1071), who initiated the rebuilding of the present church, and possibly, that of Enrico Dandolo who procured for San Marco the rich booty of the Fourth Crusade. However, both of these cases admit of a satisfactory explanation. At Contarini's death in 1071 the building was not yet sufficiently complete for burials to have taken place in it; it was certainly not consecrated before 1085. Contarini, therefore, could not have been buried in San Marco. He chose as his burial place S. Nicolo di Lido, the monastic church which he himself had erected and which had, therefore, an equal claim with San Marco to become his sepulchral church.¹⁷⁷ Enrico Dandolo (1192-1205), on the other hand, died in Constantinople and was buried in Hagia Sophia.¹⁷⁸ Thus, the church of San Marco accepted for burial only those doges who had contributed to its rebuilding or its decoration; it was not the Saint-Denis of Venice. This part was played by other churches: by S. Ilario, S. Zaccaria, S. Giorgio Maggiore, and, in the thirteenth and following centuries by the mendicant churches of SS. Giovanni e Paolo and Sta Maria Gloriosa dei Frari. All these churches were abbey or monastic churches, and this explains their attraction as burial places as against San Marco to which no monastery was attached. The fashion of dynastic burials in monastic churches seems to have been set by Byzantium. The most impressive but not the earliest instance is the monastery of the Pantocrator in Constantinople, which was for the dynasty of the Comneni what Saint-Denis was for the French kings, Lorch for the Hohenstaufen, and Steingaden for the Guelphs.¹⁷⁹

However, if San Marco was not destined to become the sepulchral church of the doges, it was in all other respects *the* ducal church. It was there that the doge was presented to the people after his election, that he was invested with the *vexillum Sancti Marci* , and that the *laudes* were sung to him.¹⁸⁰ In 1177, San Marco was the scene of the great solemnities held on the occasion of the *Pactum Venetum* between Frederick Barbarossa and the Pope; it was in his church that the Doge received, among other honors, the Golden Rose bestowed on him by Alexander III and the confirmation of the privilege to have a sword carried before him. In 1296, his name was even introduced in the Canon of the Mass. Even if the whole church was the private chapel of the doge, there was one part of it that was his especial domain: the Cappella S. Clemente, to the right (south) of the main presbytery. Here was the door through which he privately entered the church from the Ducal Palace; here stood his throne,¹⁸¹ above

¹⁷⁷ A. Da Mosto, *I dogi*, p. 45; the restored sepulchral inscription on p. 323. H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, p. 152. The abbey of S. Nicolo was founded in 1043 or 1053; G. Anrich, *Hagios Nikolaos*, p. 520.

¹⁷⁸ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, p. 321. The sepulchre was destroyed by Mohammed II. See R. Gallo, "La Tomba," with sources.

¹⁷⁹ G. Schreiber, "Byzantinisches . . . Hospital," esp. p. 123.

¹⁸⁰ Martino da Canale, *Chronique*, ed. A. Rossi, p. 562; F. Corner, *op. cit.*, X, p. 90; P. Bona, *Rerum*, II, p. 359; J. Armingaud, "Venise," p. 432; D. Vitaliani, "Contribuito"; E. Kantorowicz, *Laudes*, pp. 146, 153; H. C. Peyer, "Stadt und Stadtpatron," pp. 63 ff., 82. The earliest description we have of the investiture of a doge is that by Domenico Timus concerning the election of Domenico Selvo in 1071.

¹⁸¹ The earliest extant throne, now in the Museo della Basilica, is carved in wood and dates from the sixteenth century. G. Meschinello, *op. cit.* p. 93; F. Sansovino in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 267; the mosaics will be discussed in volume two of this study.

which appeared the image of the enthroned Pantocrator, while opposite, in full view of the enthroned doge, was the mosaic figure of the Virgin closely connected with the place of the monarch according to Byzantine usage. The place of the throne on the right-hand side of the presbytery stands in marked contrast to the usage current in the West. There, following the precedent of the Palace Chapel of Charlemagne at Aix-la-Chapelle, the ruler's place was on the western balcony, "in the 'royal box' which he shared with his angelic and superangelic patrons, whereas the pope with the apostles occupied the 'stalls' on the ground floor. . . . The Pantocrator in Heaven and the Autocrator on Earth face one another; they reflect each other and finally become transparent, with one visible only through the other, as though the monarch and his σύνθρονος θεός were interchangeable figures in the seat of the throne."¹⁸² This was the idea underlying the "Westwerke" of Frankish and German monastic churches, with their dedications to the Salvator or an archangel and their imperial thrones.¹⁸³ We do not know whether the Venetians at any time made use of the west balcony as the doge's particular domain. We do not even know whether a west balcony existed prior to 1063. As far as we can trace it back, the doge's domain seems always to have been the Cappella S. Clemente, which was the part of the church nearest to the Palace and which communicated with it directly.

Close parallels for the position of the throne in San Marco are to be found in Sicily. There, in the Cathedrals of Cefalù and Monreale, two thrones are placed opposite each other, at ground level, in the presbytery or the "chorus minor," one for the king, the other for the bishop. In both instances the throne of the king is attached to the left (north) wall.¹⁸⁴ The placing of the throne in the Sicilian churches at the left of the presbytery may have been primarily due, as was the case in Venice on the inverse side, to the situation of the royal palace. The fashion may have been set by the Palatine Chapel of Palermo, where there is reason to suppose that there was an original royal loge or balcony in the northern wall of the north transept, from which the king could attend the service without going out of his palace which was attached to the church on the north side. The mere chance of the situation of the palace and the church in relation to each other may thus explain the choice of different sides for the monarch's throne in Sicily on the one hand and in Venice on the other.¹⁸⁵

But, there exists a greater difference than merely a choice of sides between

¹⁸² Quoted from E. Kantorowicz, "Ivories," p. 73. On the interpenetration of the ideas of Christ and Monarch (Pantocrator and Autocrator) see A. Grabar, *L'empereur*, p. 98 ff., and E. Kitzinger "On the Portrait of Roger II in the Martorana in Palermo," with bibliography. The idea that the enthroned Christ and the enthroned emperor were interchangeable, found expression in the two thrones of the throne room in the Palace of Constantinople, of which the right-hand one was reserved for Christ and left empty on Sundays and feast days, but was occupied by the emperor, as viceregent of Christ, on weekdays. See A. M. Schneider, "Die Hagia Sophia in der . . . Gedankenwelt," p. 10. For the West see the bibliography in G. Bandmann, *Mittelalterliche Architektur*, p. 125 f.

¹⁸³ A. Fuchs, "Entstehung"; A. Ostendorf, "Das Salvatorpatrozinium"; G. Bandmann, *op. cit.*, p. 207 ff., with further bibliography.

¹⁸⁴ O. Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily*, p. 106; E. Kitzinger, "The Mosaics of the Cappella Palatina," p. 284.

¹⁸⁵ O. Demus, *op. cit.*, p. 52 f; E. Kitzinger, *op. cit.*, p. 283 ff. See also the review of my book on the Sicilian mosaics by E. Kitzinger, *Speculum*, XXVIII (1953), p. 143 ff. Professor Kitzinger has drawn attention to the different arrangement in the Favara Palace.

the place of the ruler in the Palatina and in San Marco respectively. If the explanation of the window or royal loge in the Palatina is correct, the place of the king was on an elevated balcony, in contrast to the floor level thrones of San Marco, Cefalù, and Monreale. It is very likely that the elevated position of the throne in the Palatina was a heritage from the Carolingian and later imperial chapels of the Frankish and Germanic north, although these had an opening in the upper story of the west wall rather than in the wall of the transept. It may have been another vestige from the Nordic past of the Normans (if it was not due to the Teuton Henry VI) that, in the latter part of the twelfth century, a new throne was placed against the west wall of the Palatina.¹⁸⁶ The two thrones of the Palatina would seem to have followed, each separately, two different "motifs" of the Carolingian or, generally, Nordic tradition: first the elevated situation, second the connection with the west wall.

Why did the Normans in Cefalù and Monreale abandon the elevated position of the throne while still following the model of the Palatina in adhering to the left-hand side of the presbytery? And why did the Venetians, too, place their doge's throne at floor level? As in other things, the model in all probability was Byzantine. It is known that in Hagia Sophia, in a part of the so-called Mitatorion, there was, up to 1204, a throne that stood on a circular slab of porphyry. Its exact location cannot be ascertained since after 1261 the porphyry disk was transferred to the southern part of the nave. It has, however, been proved by Mamboury and other scholars that the part of the Mitatorion in question must be located in the southeastern corner of the church, immediately behind the columns of the southeastern exedra; and that the throne itself must have stood between these columns. This is exactly the location of the doge's throne in San Marco.¹⁸⁷

It is even possible that the porphyry slab on which the doge's throne stood, or that served as its dorsal, is still preserved, more or less in its original position. The wall beneath the present reliquary which replaced the throne in the fourteenth century, is faced with a slab of red porphyry, while the corresponding wall on the north side, where the patriarch's throne stood, is adorned with a green stone. These two stone slabs may have belonged to the doge's and the patriarch's thrones respectively.

It is not certain at what period the thrones were erected. That in the twelfth century they already had their positions at the southern and northern confines of the presbytery is attested by the mosaic decoration of the vaults above. It is, however, possible that at the end of the eleventh century, when the present building was completed, the doge's throne was in one of the galleries which stretched at that time across the entire width of the aisles and the side chapels of the eastern part, and which were fully accessible as in the Church of the Holy Apostles. In confirmation of this latter supposition the little apsidioles at the eastern end of the galleries may be cited. It may further be supposed that the

¹⁸⁶ O. Demus, *op. cit.*, p. 46; E. Kitzinger, "The Mosaics," p. 284. The date of the throne is not certain. The ornaments point to the last quarter of the twelfth century; thus the work could belong to either William II or Henry VI.

¹⁸⁷ For the throne of Hagia Sophia see E. Mamboury, "Topographie," p. 207 ff.

removal of the throne took place in conjunction with, and may have been necessitated by the reduction of the galleries to narrow gangways. But as we know from Martino da Canale, even at a much later time, after 1250, the doge attended at least part of the Mass "a bele compagnie . . . de sor li percle" (on the gallery), after having received the *laudes* in the presbytery below.¹⁸⁸ As the extremely narrow ambulatories in the other parts of the church did not give enough room for the doge and his company, it must be assumed that the pergola ("percle") alluded to by da Canale was one of the organ lofts in the presbytery, presumably the southern one.¹⁸⁹ This may also be due to a return to, or to a survival from western practices, whereas placing the throne on the ground floor was surely a usage taken over from Byzantium.

Not far from the throne of the doge, on the walls of the presbytery of the Cappella S. Clemente, is an inscription directly addressed to the doge and exhorting him to love justice; to give everyone his due; to be the patron and benefactor of paupers, widows, minors, and orphans; and not to be influenced by fear, desire, hate, or gain. He is reminded that he, too, will die and that he will be judged after his death according to his actions.¹⁹⁰

The language of this inscription is even more outspoken than that of its model, the address of the patriarch of Constantinople to the Byzantine emperor at his coronation.¹⁹¹ The latter part in particular is almost menacing in tenor and shows that the inscription must belong to a time in which the absolute power of the dogate had been considerably reduced. The statement that the doge will be judged after his death according to his deserts is reminiscent of a curious institution, that of the *inquisitores* who had to pass judgement on the dead doge, an institution which, however, was not formally created until a later date.¹⁹² The nearest parallels to the tenor of the inscription are to be found in the *promissiones* (the coronation oaths) which had to be signed by the doges at their election from the twelfth century on.¹⁹³ It is characteristic of the Venetian state organization as against that of Byzantium, that the *promissio* was received by the magistrates of the republic, whereas the similar formula used at the coronation of the Byzantine emperor was clad in the form of an exhortation by the patriarch. The Venetian *promissiones*, which also contained clauses about the administration of, and the jurisdiction over, San Marco¹⁹⁴ are symptoms of a certain phase in the process of curtailing the power of the doges. By the first

¹⁸⁸ Martino da Canale, ed A. Rossi, p. 562.

¹⁸⁹ The west gallery would be another possibility but not a very likely one, since there the floor space is hemmed in by the "pozzo."

¹⁹⁰ The inscription, worked in inlay on a reddish marble band, is as follows:

*Dilige iustitiam, sua cunctis reddito iura:
Pauper cum vidua, pupillus et orphanus, O Dux,
Te sibi patronum sperant, pius omnibus esto;
Non timor, aut odium, vel amor, nec te trahat aurum:
Ut flos casurus dux es, cineresque futurus:
Et velut acturus, post mortem sic habiturus.*

¹⁹¹ O. Treitinger, *Kaiser- und Reichsidee*, p. 147.

¹⁹² H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 89, 579.

¹⁹³ E. Musatti, *Promissione*.

¹⁹⁴ See the *promissio* of Jacopo Tiepolo (1229) in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, facsimili, pl. XVI, nos. 70, 71; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, p. 88.

half of the eleventh century the chances of erecting a hereditary ducal monarchy had already passed with the eclipse of the Candiani and Orseoli; and from about 1140 on the power of the dogate was increasingly hemmed in, and even replaced, by the growing might of the *commune Venetiarum*.¹⁹⁵ This terminus occurs first in 1143, two years after the first mention of the *Sapientes*, who were the representatives of the commune. The new consultative and controlling body, the nucleus of the later and more intricate system of councils and authorities, very soon began to impose its will on the doge. At the same time, it aimed at the elimination of all influence of the *populus*, the common people of Venice, —although the term *populus* is applied from 1180 onwards to the commune itself. In the half century from the accession in 1152 of Domenico Morosini, the first doge to take the oath on the *promissio*, to about 1200, the real power in the state passed from the doge to the commune. The process in which the creation of the Major and Minor Councils, first mentioned in 1185, marked a decisive step, ended finally with the institution of the Correttori and Inquisitori, created in 1229, at the accession of Jacopo Tiepolo. From that time on the position of the doge might well have been described in the words of a later date: *In sollemnitatibus imperator, in curia senator, in urbe captivus, ex urbe reus*. It will be seen later that the inscription in the Cappella S. Clemente is not the only monumental evidence to be found in San Marco of the gradual change in the character of the dogate. The tenor of the inscription is repeated in some parts of the decoration, with its insistence on justice, judgment, clemency, virtue, and similar themes, all exemplified by figurative mosaics and by inscriptions. The insistence on "humility" is in itself a trait customary in the "ruler-liturgy" of the Middle Ages and perhaps inherited from Byzantium. But the fact that these ideas found expression in inscriptions and in pictorial mosaics seems to be specifically Venetian. The preoccupation with justice and law becomes especially noticeable in the first half of the thirteenth century, the period when the Venetian codes of law received the form which they were to retain for so long. The most important steps in this course of codification and rationalization of Venetian law were the final redactions of criminal law in 1232 and of civil law in 1242, both under Jacopo Tiepolo.¹⁹⁶

During the time when the doges were more and more hedged in by *promissiones*, codifications, advisory bodies, etc., their outward pomp was increased in direct ratio to their loss of power.¹⁹⁷ The simple golden circlet which was the ducal diadem in 1174 had, by 1200, become a golden crown set with jewels. The "corno," the characteristic ducal berretto, came into use in the thirteenth century, and was surrounded with a golden crown by Raniero Zeno (1253–1268).¹⁹⁸ The

¹⁹⁵ A. Hain, *Der Doge*; W. Lenel, *Die Entstehung*, p. 107ff.; B. Schmeidler, "Der Dux"; R. Cessi, *Venezia ducale*, I, *Duca e popolo*.

¹⁹⁶ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 110ff., 583, with bibliography; E. Besta, *Il diritto*.

¹⁹⁷ S. Romanin, *Storia*, I, pp. 98ff., 184f.; B. Cecchetti, *Il doge*, pp. 19ff., 43; A. Hain, *op. cit.*, p. 25ff.; P. Molmenti, *Storia*, *passim*, esp. I, p. 249ff.; A. da Mosto, *op. cit.*, p. 22ff.; P. Molmenti, *La dogaressa*. On the *corno* and the sacred sword, see Martino da Canale, *Chronique*, ed. A. Rossi, p. 740, notes 284, 286.

¹⁹⁸ G. Zanetti, *Dissertazione*; P. Molmenti, *Storia*, I, p. 249ff. R. Zeno († 1268) is said to have been the first doge who wore a fringe of gold on the ducal berretto. F. C. Hodgson, *Venice in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*, p. 119.

red shoes of the doges were adopted, probably after 1204, as a heritage of the Byzantine emperor; they are still blue in the doge's portrait of the Pala (1105). Ermine and purple were adopted as sacred imperial colors. From 1252 on, the ducal coats of arms were suspended from the galleries of San Marco, to be taken down in 1730 because their excessive weight threatened the structure of the arcades.¹⁹⁹ Great ceremonial processions,²⁰⁰ such as those known from Gentile Bellini's and Carpaccio's paintings, began to develop in the thirteenth century; the first representations of them are to be found among the mosaics of San Marco. The doge was made the center of a cult; he became himself a sacred relic.

In his own church the doge's originally absolute power was impinged upon, especially in the course of the thirteenth century. This was not due primarily to the ecclesiastic authorities. The doge knew how to defend his rights against claims from this side, as in the case of the bishop of Castello.²⁰¹ Generally speaking, the clergy lost during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries almost all of its former influence on affairs of state. Even the Inquisition did not completely have its own way in Venice. In 1249, after considerable resistance, to which an inscription in the atrium of San Marco seems to allude, Marino Morosini undertook in his *promissio* to prosecute and punish convicted heretics. At the same time, Morosini asserted that the examination of the suspect was to be carried out by laymen and the verdict to be given by the doge and his councillors. This procedure fell considerably short of the wishes of the Roman Curia. Even in 1289, when, after a long struggle, the Inquisition proper was introduced, the doge retained control over the Holy Office.²⁰²

Thus it was not by the clergy that the full jurisdiction of the doge over all matters regarding the ducal chapel was curtailed. Instead, it was a new civic authority, the magistracy of the procuratori, which had developed into a powerful office in the Venetian state.²⁰³ Originally, the Procurazia was responsible for the financial administration, the building, and the decoration of the church. Since one of the earliest procurators of whom we have reliable evidence, Otho Basilius, (1151-2) is called *Procurator operis ecclesiae Sancti Marci*,²⁰⁴ it seems that the supervision of the building was the procurator's first duty.

¹⁹⁹ For the ducal coats of arms see A. da Mosto, *op. cit.* p. 26; *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, no. 95; on the Lion of St. Mark, see: G. Boni, "Il leone"; J. B. Ward Perkins, "The Bronze Lion," and *supra* note 84.

²⁰⁰ Martino da Canale, *op. cit.*, p. 562 ff.

²⁰¹ On the altercation between Marco Michiel, Bishop of Castello, and Doge Jacopo Tiepolo (1229-1249) see *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 23.

²⁰² P. Sarpi, *Discorso*; G. Cappelletti, *Storia*, p. 649 ff.; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 41 ff.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 87 f., 578 f., with bibliography. On heretic movements see G. Volpe, *Movimenti*.

²⁰³ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 86 f., 578, points out that the history of the Procurazia, which may throw light on the economic development of Venice, still remains to be written. A certain amount of material is to be found in *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 368 f.; F. Manfredi, *Dignità*; F. Corner, *Ecclesiae Venetae*, XIII/1, p. 312 ff., XVIII, p. 274; F. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 209 ff.; G. B. Galliccioli, *Memorie*, III, p. 148 ff.; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 29 ff. and *Documenti*, p. 294 ff. (after Meschinello), with partly spurious lists; C. Neumann, "Die Markuskirche," p. 645 ff.; H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 242, 373, 502 f., II, pp. 86 f., 578.

²⁰⁴ M. Sanudo, *Vite dei dogi*, ed. G. Monticolo, p. 241; *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 9, no. 79; *Testo*, p. 29 and *Documenti* p. 8, no. 70, mention an even earlier *Procurator operis B. Marci*, Angelus Faletro, of the beginning of the twelfth century. The only evidence for this, however, is the fifteenth-century chronicle of Zorzi Dolfin.

That this duty also embraced the decoration of the church can be inferred from many later documents, the most interesting being an edict of the Procurazia of 1258, by which even minor details regarding the organization of the mosaicists' work were regulated.²⁰⁵ The numerous bequests of the late twelfth century led, however, to an evolution of the office which was certainly not foreseen at the beginning: the Procurazia became the most important financial authority of the state, the center of financial transactions, the depot for the property of minors, the Venetian Chancery Court, and, finally, a kind of state bank. From the middle of the twelfth century on, the funds of the Procurazia were greatly increased by payments from the overseas settlements, colonial taxes, dues, the income of the churches of St. Mark in the Venetian settlements abroad, and so forth, especially after the Impresa of Constantinople. An inscription above the doge's private entrance in the Cappella S. Clemente refers to one of the *immunitates* which helped to swell the income of the Church. The fact that such an inscription found a place in San Marco shows how indissolubly affairs of state finance were bound up with the church through the Procurazia.²⁰⁶

In keeping with the paramount importance of the Procurazia, the bearers of this office, who, until the end of the thirteenth century, were nominated by the doge, and later were elected for life by the Grand Council, held the highest rank after the doge; they even wore ducal garments, without, of course, the specific insignia of the doge. The rise of the procuratorial power, together with the general Venetian tendency towards division of responsibilities, caused a steady increase in the number of procuratori. Since, however, the documentary evidence is very scant and since the tradition was, at a later date, falsified by accounts fabricated in order to underline the importance and antiquity of the institution,²⁰⁷ it is difficult to fix the various stages of this development. The early names and dates of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries are certainly spurious.²⁰⁸ Whether the Leo da Molino who, at the beginning of the twelfth century, commissioned the central bronze doors leading from the narthex into the interior of the church was a procurator is not certain, though this is likely.²⁰⁹ The office certainly existed in the first half of the twelfth century, though the earliest verifiable date is that of Otho Basilius, of 1151-52. The increase of procuratorial business in the second half of the twelfth century made the addition of a second procurator necessary, at least temporarily, though at what exact time the office of the second procurator was created cannot be determined with certainty. Two are said to have been in office between 1187 and 1192.²¹⁰ It is, however, possible that the second procurator was in office for only a limited time, since an anonymous chronicle of the fourteenth century refers to Angelo Falier

²⁰⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, no. 96.

²⁰⁶ On the inscription and its import, see L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," p. 36ff.

²⁰⁷ There are several manuscript "Cronache dei Procuratori," composed at the instigation of the Procurazia in the seventeenth century. These are now preserved in the Archivio dello Stato and the Biblioteca Marciana. See *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 29.

²⁰⁸ The list given by F. Corner, *loc. cit.*, is derived, as regards the series of procuratori from 811 to 1114 *ex fabulosis chronicis*. For 1131 Corner mentions "Justinus Baduarius Procurator."

²⁰⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 403ff.

²¹⁰ H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 503; L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, p. 73, with bibliography and sources.

as *solus procurator* in 1209.²¹¹ This seems to be authenticated by the decree (of the Grand Council) of 14 March 1231, by which Petrus Dandolo was elected second procurator. The growth of business necessitated even further additions to the Collegium: a third (?) procurator in 1260-61, a fourth (?) in 1266-67. There were six procurators active in 1319 and nine in 1442.²¹²

The rise of the Procurazia marks the transition of San Marco from the doge's private chapel to the state church of Venice. This new character, evolved in the twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century, helped to shape the decoration of San Marco and is mirrored in the iconography of its mosaics. As a state sanctuary it also became the repository for politically important spoils and trophies. We do not know the import and the political implications of all the single items with which the church was decorated inside and out, but the case of the Pillars of Acre and the Pietra del Bando, which were set up to commemorate a victory over the Genoese, makes it likely that most or all of the spoils had political connotations. In fact, the political point of view had such great importance for the Venetians that every detail of the decoration of their state church could, and did, take on a political aspect. An illustration of this is the anecdote that refers to the visit of a Genoese ambassador during the wars against this city. Passing San Marco on his way to the Ducal Palace, the ambassador pointed out to a Venetian in his company that even Christ seemed to favor the Genoese side, since in the mosaic representing the Resurrection He held a banner with the colors of Genoa, a red cross on white ground. The Venetian patrician Orsato Giustiniani took this mockery so much to heart, that he had the red cross on the banner immediately replaced by the Lion of St. Mark, so that he might enjoy the stupefaction of the Genoese when they again passed the church within the hour.²¹³

It is only to be expected that in a state church like San Marco an order of rites and ceremonies of a special kind should have developed.²¹⁴ However, it would be wrong to assume, as has been done, that San Marco had its own *ritus*, different from that of other Italian churches. Nor was the so-called "rito patriarchino," which was taken over from Grado, a Greek or Oriental rite. It had nothing to do with Constantinople, but was Gregorian and closely allied to the early Roman. As in all matters touching San Marco, the thirteenth century brought a well-established order of ritual. Moro Simeone, Primicerius of San Marco from 1278 to 1291, had a *Rituale* compiled by the *Magister Ceremonia-*

²¹¹ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 11, no. 88.

²¹² The dates for the procuratori of the thirteenth century are not firmly established. I have followed H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, II, p. 578; *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 368f. F. Manfredi, *op. cit.*, and F. Sansovino, *op. cit.*, p. 209ff., give the same dates, with the third procurator added under Doge Ranieri Zen (1253-68); whereas P. Molmenti in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 29f. has the third procurator elected in 1239 and the fourth in 1261. The question whether the procurator added in 1261 was the third or the fourth is important because the date of one of the mosaics of San Marco, in which three procuratori seem to be represented, may hinge on it. See also O. Böhm, "Note," with erroneous dates, and L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

²¹³ P. Saccardo, *Les mosaïques*, p. 217, after Stringa.

²¹⁴ *Psalterium; Officium; Litaniae*; for full references see the bibliography in F. Macchietta, *De divino officio*; G. Meschinello, *La chiesa ducale*, III/2, p. 41ff.; J. Diclich, *Rito*; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 65ff.; H. C. Peyer, *Stadt und Stadtpatron*, p. 12f.

rum, Bartolomeo Bonifazio, which was in use for a long time; it was revised once more at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Notable departures from the rites of other churches concern the lections and litanies used in San Marco. Thus, for instance, the Itala version of the Bible was preferred there to the Vulgate.

The influences of Byzantium on the rites and ceremonies of San Marco were few, the most important being the introduction of the *benedictio aquae*, in the course of which the reliquary of the True Cross was three times immersed in Holy Water. The date of this festival was the sixth of January, the date on which the Greek Church commemorated the Baptism of Christ.

The most interesting part of the ritual and ceremonial of San Marco concerns those functions in which the doge took an active part. The list of these functions²¹⁵ comprises, of course, the great festivals of the ecclesiastical year but also a number of feasts which were specifically Venetian, e.g., the *Translatio Sancti Marci* (January 31), the feast of St. Isidore (April 16), the vigil and the feast of St. Mark (April 24 and 25), and the *Apparitio Sancti Marci* (June 25). One of the chief feasts was that of the Ascension, perhaps dating from the late eleventh century. Naturally, the doge also assisted at special functions held on the occasion of Venetian victories or at critical moments of war. Some of these functions, celebrated in the thirteenth century, have found an eloquent recorder in Martino da Canale.²¹⁶ From these records it seems that San Marco combined what were, particularly in Byzantine times, characteristic functions of different buildings. For instance, in Constantinople the liturgical salutation of the emperor by the patriarch and the bishops took place in the Chrysotriklinos and was followed by a procession to, and celebration of the liturgy in, one of the churches.²¹⁷ In Venice all this took place in San Marco. One reason for combining these functions was, perhaps, the fact that Venice had no "Sacred Palace." The doge's palace was first and foremost the dwelling and the "office building" of the doge, and not, as in Byzantium, the hallowed precinct of the ruler's sanctified and liturgically circumscribed life. This characteristic difference holds good for the entire West. When, for example, Charlemagne took over part of the Byzantine cult of the ruler in his *Renovatio Imperii Romani*, the scene of the corresponding ceremonies and liturgical functions was not the palace, but the palace chapel. If Professor Fichtenau is right, the latter was an adaptation of a Byzantine architectural prototype which, however, was the Chrysotriklinos rather than a church.²¹⁸ San Marco, on the other hand, was church and throne room in one. Moreover, it has been said above, and this will have to be repeated in the following chapters, that San Marco was connected by many specific ties with the Apostoleion of Constantinople. Both were martyria, dynastic churches, and, to a certain extent, sepulchral churches. Finally, there is yet another building in the capital of Byzantium that, as a living organism in the body politic of the Empire, presented important analogies with

²¹⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 201.

²¹⁶ Martino da Canale, ed. A. Rossi, pp. 424 ff., 524 ff., 552 ff., 558 ff.

²¹⁷ O. Treitinger, *Kaiser- und Reichsidee*, p. 221 ff.

²¹⁸ H. Fichtenau, "Byzanz."

San Marco, namely, Hagia Sophia. If the Apostoleion was, at least for a certain period, the religious center of the dynasty, Hagia Sophia had a higher function. The latter church was, from its rebuilding by Justinian onwards, destined to become the religious and political center of the Empire. It was the symbol of Justinian's imperial power. In his edict of April 1, 535, the Emperor called it "the mother of our imperial power" and later on it was even styled "the mother of the world," the religious center of the Oecumene.²¹⁹

This is exactly what San Marco was for the Venetians. More than any other ecclesiastical foundation of the West, it was the symbol and the center of political power, the state church *par excellence*. Venetian historians of the thirteenth century devote to the description of the church and of the state ceremonies enacted in it an important place in their narratives.²²⁰ It was the hub of the Venetian Empire, the ground on which the doge, the commune, the populus and the clergy met, the pledge of political and spiritual unity. It was more than Hagia Sophia, the Apostoleion, or the Chrysotriklinos of the sacred palace. It was the martyrion of the state saint, palace and coronation hall, dynastic church, state sanctuary, and even parliament. In this respect it was without equal among mediaeval churches.

It may be thought that, if this were so, all things connected with San Marco would be illuminated by the clear light of history. However, the contrary is true: The state church shares with the official historiography of Venice the mythical twilight that envelops everything that is connected with the rise of the republic. Venice, or at least Rialto, the heart of Venice, had appeared comparatively late in the history of the Mediterranean. It had no past—and to be without a past was, in the Middle Ages, very much like being a man without a shadow, like Chamisso's Peter Schlemihl. However, to cure this defect, the statesmen of the Middle Ages had a remedy, the same one which is used even today. If one had no past, one could always fabricate one. Indeed, this was easier then than it is now. The forgers of the Middle Ages were not as hampered as are we by existing records, proofs, and counterproofs; they could fake freely to suit their needs.

This is what the Venetians did, especially at a time when the dignity and the background of a great national past were most needed. This need was greatest in the thirteenth century when the new Venetian Empire of the Levant was in the making. It is known from many other instances that great new ventures of this kind were dissimulated by being made to appear as the continuation or the *renovatio* of an earlier institution which held all the magic of the hallowed past.²²¹ Thus, Charlemagne, the German Otto's, and Frederick II presumed to renew or to resurrect the Empire of the Romans in order to surround their political plans with the desired halo of historical legitimacy, and to set a model before their helpers and subjects. Frederick, especially, was very explicit in this respect. He declared that he felt the

²¹⁹ A. M. Schneider, "Die Hagia Sophia in der ... Gedankenwelt," p. 5 ff.

²²⁰ See e.g. Martino da Canale, *op. cit.*, pp. 290 ff., 424 ff., 524 f., 552, 550 ff., etc.

²²¹ F. Schneider, *Rom und Romgedanke*; E. Kantorowicz, *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite*; P. E. Schramm, "Kaiser."

sacred power of the Roman Caesars in himself and that it was his aim from the beginning to renew Rome and her nobility.²²² His court and his people were quick enough to see in him the reborn Julius Caesar. Terms like Quirites and Senatus came into use again and, at least in Rome itself, the emperors restituted the semblance of the Julian principate. To this were added all the trappings which the arts could give to the "Roman" façade of Frederick's Empire. The *renovatio* gave birth to a protorenaissance whose works were inspired by Roman sculpture.²²³

When Frederick came to Venice in 1232, in order to pay his respects to St. Mark, he was received with cool civility. The republic viewed with suspicion a ruler who claimed, as the pretended heir of the Caesars, to be the *dominus mundi*. When a Venetian goldsmith was commissioned by the Emperor to make him a golden crown, the question whether the goldsmith should be allowed to undertake the work was debated in the Grand Council and finally settled in the affirmative only on condition that the interests of the republic should not be prejudiced.²²⁴ It is understandable that the Venetians should have been wary. The Emperor's claims were at variance with their own pretensions, especially since, at least in the eastern Mediterranean, the republic had taken the place of the Byzantine basileus who had regarded himself as the legitimate heir to the Imperium which Justinian had re-established after the fall of the Western Roman Empire.²²⁵ In fact, there was at the same time a *renovatio* in full swing in Venice, too. The idea of the renewed *Imperium Romanum* was bound to take root in a state whose doge styled himself *Dominator quartae et dimidiaie partis totius Romaniae*, and who was, in spite of the "Latin" emperor, the true master of Constantinople. The new Venetian Empire of the Levant, enlarged by the island principalities of noble Venetian families in the Aegean, needed no more than the semblance of legitimacy. This was to be provided, in part, by reference to the divine will by which Venice was given possession of the Patrimony of Mark, the Evangelist; in part by an attempt to let the new "Empire" appear as the *renovatio* of an old and sacred institution. This institution could not be the pagan Roman Empire of the Caesars, as in Frederick's case. Neither could it be the Byzantine Empire of the Comneni and Angeli which the Venetians had done everything to destroy. It had to be the Christian Empire of Justinian, of Constantine, a fictitious "apostolic" empire of the East. To let the Venetians appear not only as the ideal, but as the real and legitimate successors of the "apostolic emperors" Constantine and Justinian, a continuity of "descent" had to be established. This is why the foundation of Venice was ante-dated by three centuries, why fantastic genealogies were fabricated, and why the oldest families were called "apostolic." The claim to be

²²² E. Kantorowicz, *ibid.*, p. 404 ff.

²²³ E. Bertaux, *Italie méridionale*, p. 593 ff.; K. Frey, "Ursprung," p. 270 ff.; A. Haseloff, "Kaiserinnengräber"; W. Wackernagel, "Die Plastik"; C. H. Haskins, *Studies*, p. 300 ff.; H. Keller, "Die Entstehung," p. 268 ff., etc. Professor J. Deér's book (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, V), on the porphyry tombs of the Norman period in Sicily, in which the concept of a protorenaissance is applied to the period of Roger II of Sicily, was not accessible to me at the time of writing.

²²⁴ E. Kantorowicz, *Kaiser Friedrich*, p. 346.

²²⁵ P. E. Schramm, *op. cit.*, I, p. 9.

the *fili primogeniti Sancti Marci* was taken almost literally. To strengthen the motif of continuity in time by that of contiguity in space, the proto-humanists seized upon the fable of the Trojan descent of the Venetians. The motif of Troy and that of the Veneti with their tribal hero Hercules, were, however, only a sideline; the accent was on the *renovatio imperii christiani* with all its implications.

There is a distinct family likeness among the *renovationes* of the Middle Ages. Certain themes recur from the sixth to the thirteenth century, as, for instance, the appearance of the "senate," together with the fiction of the principate; the use of purple by the chief magistrates; certain phrases and attitudes in official historiography; the collecting and codifying of legal and juridical matter; and, perhaps most characteristic, certain typical developments in the visual arts, the so-called "protorenaissances."²²⁶ It will be seen that Venice, too, had its protorenaissance in the thirteenth century, a movement which had many things in common with the Apulian protorenaissance of Frederick II. Like the latter it was archaistic and ephemeral.

The main difference between the two contemporary movements is that the Venetian protorenaissance had its main accent on the Christian element, not on the pagan-imperial, as in the Apulian one. It will be seen later that the Venetian artists of the thirteenth century took palaeo-Christian or early Byzantine works as their prototypes, or used such works after adapting them to their purpose. Another difference is that in Venice the imitation of earlier models was not restricted to sculpture. Venetian painters and architects also drew their inspiration from Early Christian or Justinianic models.²²⁷ Thus, the Venetian protorenaissance seems to have had a broader basis than that of Frederick II, or even that of Tuscany in which painting had no part.²²⁸ In Venice the profound interest in things Early Christian can also be seen in the literary field, quite apart from hagiography and official historiography. For instance, the great number of Venetian manuscripts of the early Apocrypha in the Marciana show that these writings were studied and copied in Venice from the thirteenth century on.²²⁹

It is true that all mediaeval *renovationes* were deeply influenced, perhaps even caused, by the position of their *auctores* in a Christian political world,²³⁰ and that all mediaeval art was specifically Christian. But the Venetian protorenaissance bears this characteristic to a higher degree than that of Frederick II in Apulia. In this respect it is nearer to the Carolingian *renovatio*, which,

²²⁶ E. Panofsky, "Renaissance"; W. Paatz, "Renaissance," with bibliography; H. v. Einem, "Monumentalplastik"; R. H. L. Hamann-McLean, "Antikenstudium," with bibliography; J. Roosval, "Proto-Renaissance"; A. J. Toynbee, *A Study*, IX, pp. 1-86.

²²⁷ For the concept of the Venetian protorenaissance (first introduced by the author in a paper read in March 1952, before the Austrian Byzantine Society in Vienna) see O. Demus, "A Renaissance," with bibliography, and *infra*, p. 101 ff.

²²⁸ On the Tuscan protorenaissance see W. Paatz, "Die Hauptströmungen," with bibliography.

²²⁹ C. von Tischendorf, *Evangelia*, 2nd ed. p. LXXIII, ff. On performances of mystery plays based on the *Evangelium Nicodemi* in thirteenth-century Padua see R. P. Wülcker, *Das Evangelium Nicodemi*, p. 65.

²³⁰ On some of the specifically Christian ideas underlying the mediaeval renovations see G. Ladner, "Die mittelalterliche Reformidee."

politically and artistically, had a similarly pronounced Christian character and, therefore, sought its models preferably in Early Christian works of art, even as regards architecture.²³¹ The Venetian *renovatio*, however, distinguished itself from the Carolingian by the fact that it was not inspired, as the latter was, by the "Golden Age" of Early Christian art in Rome, but by the art of Constantinople and the Christian East in general. This also distinguishes the Venetian *renovatio* from the movements which took place in the South of France in the twelfth century and in Rome at the end of the Ducento, both of which were movements that took their departure from specifically local antecedents.²³² Not Rome, Italy, nor the West, but Constantinople and Alexandria were the sources of the Venetian *renovatio*.

It is not merely by chance that San Marco provides the key for this new interpretation.²³³ The church is, generally speaking, the key to the understanding of all Venice, of its history and of its art. As a monument not of popular piety, but of "old-style" political religiosity,²³⁴ it was shaped not so much by impersonal and largely unconscious trends and sentiments, but by the conscious will of a ruling caste, whose representatives wanted it to be the visible symbol and the programmatic embodiment of their ideas.

Among these ideas there was little room for the new popular trends and tendencies which elsewhere changed the face of mediaeval towns and states and especially the character of the churches of the thirteenth century. The few traces of Patarenism, Franciscanism, or Spiritualism that can be found in San Marco appear completely "neutralized" by the official spirit of the church and its decoration. Even Joachimism, which did, to some extent, penetrate into Venice was made to serve the official historical myths. It has been pointed out above that Joachim of Flora was prevailed upon, probably during his stay in Venice towards the close of the twelfth century, to exert his great influence on behalf of Grado's claims to equality with, if not superiority to, Aquileia. A later tradition even made him a dweller in San Marco, for whose mosaics he was said to have created the program; and some single mosaics were connected with him as objects and materializations of his prophecies. It is not surprising that, in keeping with the Venetian habit of making everything connected with San Marco appear older than it was, Joachim's lifetime was antedated by a whole century.

The humanist movement, then in its early stages, also had the fate of being harnessed to the service of Venice's political religion. The ghost of Troy was conjured up to lend plausibility to the Venetian territorial claims in the Levant; Alexander, carried to heaven by griffins, appears as a personification of political power reaching beyond its natural confines; and images of the mythical hero Hercules were set in the main façade of San Marco side by side with reliefs showing warrior saints and guardian archangels, to ward off all dangers and

²³¹ See R. Krautheimer, "The Carolingian Revival."

²³² R. Hamann, "Altchristliches"; W. Paeseler, "Der Rückgriff."

²³³ On the history and criticism of the concept see W. Paatz, "Renaissance," with bibliography. The term was first used by the literary historian K. Burdach, *Reformation*.

²³⁴ This term is borrowed from E. Peterson, *Der Monotheismus*.

enemies from the state church which harbored the *pignora imperii*, the relics of the Evangelist.

The story of San Marco begins with these relics. In its long life is mirrored the development of the ideas prevalent from the ninth century on. It tells of the struggle of the Venetians for security; of their endeavors to reach ecclesiastic independence and to found a national Church; of their fight for political freedom; and, finally, of their tenacious will for power and domination. These single-minded aims of the Venetian ruling class were fully attained in the thirteenth century, the period when San Marco was completed. Soon afterwards the old political ideals were relinquished for that of wealth. This new "ideal," too, has left its traces in San Marco. Indeed, it has all but disfigured this unique monument.

BOOK TWO

ARCHITECTURE

I. THE PREDECESSORS OF SAN MARCO

The first building of San Marco had two predecessors: as the doges' chapel of Rialto it was preceded by S. Teodoro, and as the shrine of the Saint's relics, by a tower (chapel?) *in angulo palatii*. S. Teodoro existed certainly as early as 819 or even before.¹ It cannot, however, be stated with absolute certainty whether it was situated inside or outside the area of the present San Marco, or, whether, as is probable, the present interior wall of the chapel of St. Isidore was the outer south wall of S. Teodoro. We know that the chapel was decorated with paintings or mosaics and with inscriptions which contained the names of the doge and the bishop of Olivolo who erected it. It was, furthermore, adorned with "precious columns and stones."² In view of this dearth of information—all we know is contained in a short passage in the tenth-century *Chronicon Venetum* (or *Altinate*)—any attempt at a graphic reconstruction of the chapel of S. Teodoro must surely be in vain.³ The character of its Patron Saint, the Greek warrior Saint Theodore, might suggest a domed building of Byzantine type. It is not unlikely that the building was actually built by Greek masters or under the guidance of a Greek architect, since it is attested that, a little later (*ca.* 820–827), the Basileus (Leo V) sent architects for the building of the monastic church of S. Zaccaria (dedicated in 829).⁴

Of the chapel or tower of the Ducal Palace, the first resting place of the Marcian relics, we know even less. The chronicle of Magno speaks only of a "camera secreta in palazzo"⁵; Johannes Diaconus says that the doge *in sui palatii angulo peragere fecit capellam, ubi illud* [the relics of St. Mark] *reconditum possit reservari, interimque esset ecclesia expleta*.⁶ Venetian tradition unanimously identified this corner of the Ducal Palace with the present Tesoro of San Marco—an identification which, however, lacks concrete proof and so must remain doubtful, especially as the outer walls of the Tesoro are strictly parallel and, as regards the south wall, even in line with the walls of the church. In addition, the walls are not homogeneous, their thickness having been added to after their first completion, probably in order to make the Tesoro as secure as possible.

¹ See *supra*, p. 21 and notes 71ff. with bibliography, esp. G. Saccardo, "L'antica chiesa," G. Marzemin, *Le origini*, p. 237ff., F. Forlati, "Il primo San Marco," p. 73.

² According to the *Chronicon Altinate*: *Cuba [sic] dipingere preciosissime fingere precepit* [Narses] *litteris memorie recordationis tam ad honorem ducis quam Olivolensis episcopi cuius tempore fuit fundata*. H. Simonsfeld, *Venezianische Studien*, p. 48. G. Marzemin, *op. cit.*, claims to have found a few capitals of S. Teodoro (ascribed by him to the sixth century) in San Marco: pl. VIII, fig. 9.

³ See the attempt by R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, fig. 7 on p. 113, reprinted in L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," fig. 9.

⁴ F. Sansovino, *Venetia*, I, p. 26ff. The instrument of the dedication of 829 by Justinian Participaci, in which the Doge states that he acts on imperial order, is reprinted in S. Romanin, *Storia*, I, p. 347, app. no. 1; on the building: R. Cattaneo, *L'architettura*, p. 237f. and *idem*, *Architettura in Italy*, p. 279f.

⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 1, no. 1. Speculations on the chapel in G. Marzemin, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

⁶ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 3, no. 21; G. Monticolo, "Cronache," p. 110.

II. THE FIRST CHURCH OF SAN MARCO

The building of the church proper, the first San Marco, was begun shortly after the relics had reached Venice in 829. The most important document about the foundation of this church is the testament of the Doge Justinian Partecipacius († 829) which has come down to us in a copy of the fourteenth century.⁷ In this testament the Doge instructed his wife to build a church in honor of St. Mark, *infra territorio Sancti Zachariae*, that is, below the garden of the nearby nunnery. He also made provision for the building material to be taken mainly from the surplus stones assembled for the building of the abbey of S. Ilario. The rest of the material was to be supplied from other sources, among them a house in Torcello. This seems to indicate that the church was built, at least in part, of "prefabricated" material, which may have included some ancient spoils.

Justinian, who died soon afterwards, apparently did not even begin the building, in spite of Johannes Diaconus' assertion to the contrary. If the work had been commenced during his lifetime, he would hardly have taken the trouble to indicate in his last will the spot where the church was to be built. But his widow and John, his brother and successor, acted according to his last will and completed the church in the thirties of the ninth century.⁸

Although nothing of this first church of San Marco is visible today, the question as to its architectural type and its dimensions is of primary importance since these may have influenced the shape and the dimensions of the present church. Some of the building material assembled by Justinian Partecipacius for the first shrine of the Evangelist may even be contained in the later San Marco.⁹ The sources do not provide any solid basis for the reconstruction of the original building. The only indications, not very dependable in themselves, are contained in the *Translatio Sci Marci* and in the *Chronicon Altinate* (*Venetum*) which clearly follows the narrative of the *Translatio*, except for an error as to the name of the founder. The same prototype—the Holy Sepulchre—is claimed by the *Chronicon Altinate* for the substructures of San Marco and of S. Salvatore, and by the late chronicle of Magno for those of S. Zaccaria.¹⁰ As has been pointed out above, it is not advisable to lay too much stress on this alleged relationship between the first San Marco and the

⁷ The document is printed, in an abbreviated form, in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 3, no. 20; complete, in A. Gloria, *Codice*, I, p. 12 f. and R. Cessi, "Documenti," p. 93. See also, *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 112 ff. A further document (on the cession of territory by the nuns of S. Zaccaria) is alluded to in an anonymous chronicle of the seventeenth century: *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 3, no. 18.

⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 1, nos. 1-14, 17, 19, 21, 22, p. 209, no. 806. The earliest of the sources reporting the completion of the church under Johannes Partecipacius is the history of Johannes Diaconus (G. Monticolo, *op. cit.*, p. 112). A later (anonymous) chronicle (Doc. no. 22) gives the completion date of 832. See also the bibliography and the sources indicated *supra*, bk. I, notes 33 f.

⁹ To the bibliography on the first church of San Marco, listed by F. Forlati, *op. cit.*, p. 73, notes 3 and 4, should be added: O. Mothes, *Geschichte*, I, p. 68 f.; G. Marzemin, *op. cit.*, p. 304 ff.; and G. Lorenzetti, *San Marco*, p. 6 f.

¹⁰ See *supra*, p. 45 and note 168. The passage of the *Translatio* was also taken over by F. Corner, *Ecclesiae Venetae*, reprinted in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 209, no. 806. The passage of the *Cronaca Magno* on S. Zaccaria is quoted by R. Cattaneo in both *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 118 and *Architecture in Italy*, p. 302.

church of the Holy Sepulchre. The statement, which is more precise in the passage regarding the church of S. Salvatore,¹¹ applied probably to the subterranean crypts of the three churches.¹² As in so many instances of mediaeval "copying," the *tertium comparationis* may have been some detail, partly technical and partly symbolic, such as numbers of steps or measurements.¹³

In any case, the statement of the Venetian chronicles does not offer any great help in reconstructing the plan and appearance of the first Marcian church. As to the type and ground plan of this church, until lately most authorities agreed that it was a basilical building with a wooden roof. According to Cattaneo, it was of rather modest size; he assumed that it stretched from the present west wall of the nave to the eastern end of the transept, and terminated in only one apse, the aisles being closed towards the east by straight walls as in the Ravennate basilicas.¹⁴ Cattaneo deduced the size of the original building from late chronicles which speak of the first building as small, compared with the new church of the eleventh century.¹⁵ A number of chronicles insist also on the fact that the new church had a different ground plan, being built "in altra maniera di quello la era a quel tempo." Most authors have assumed—without any proofs for such an assumption—that the main walls of the present building rest on the foundations of the ninth-century church, with the exception of the presbytery, transept, and atrium, all of which, according to the prevalent opinion, were added in the eleventh century.¹⁶

Recently, however, this assumption, which had found its way into practically all the current handbooks, was challenged by the results of the soundings and excavations undertaken in 1950 by Ing. F. Forlati.¹⁷ From these we learn, first, that where we should expect continuous wall foundations crossing the transepts along the line that connects the walls of the western crossarm with those of the presbytery, there is no such masonry. Nor were any traces found of the foundations of the colonnades which ought to have been extant in the continuation of the existing columnar arcade. Second, it can now be proved that the material and technique of the transept walls—newly built, according to Cattaneo's theory, in the eleventh century—are identical with those of the west and north walls, which were assumed to belong, at least in their lower strata, to the first church of the ninth century. Third, it seems that the foundation stones of the central pillars are of Roman workmanship and may in fact be part of the ancient spoils which Justinian Partecipacius in his last will

¹¹ *Cavarniti fecerunt ecclesiam ad honorem Domini et Salvatoris. In gratis ferreis pavimento fecerunt: subius autem meatus aque rigantur in ea forma sicut in Jerosolimis ad Domini tumulum ibique facta ecclesia videntur*: H. Simonsfeld, *op. cit.*, p. 50, note 1. No less explicit is the passage in the *Cronaca Magno*, referring to S. Zaccaria: *Sono annali dicono questo doxe* [Pietro Tribuno, 888–912] *in San Zaccaria aver fatto far un monumento al muodo de quello de nostro signor al qual se andava per una scala in do rami* (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 118, no. 2).

¹² This is also the opinion of R. Cattaneo, in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 118f.

¹³ R. Krautheimer, "Introduction," esp. p. 17.

¹⁴ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 114ff.; reconstruction of ground plan on p. 113, fig. 7.

¹⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 2, nos. 11, 12, p. 6, nos. 58, 59.

¹⁶ See the ground plan reproduced in L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, fig. 10, in which the walls of the first church, assumed to have been re-used in the third, are drawn in black.

¹⁷ F. Forlati, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

intended to be used for the erection of his church. They are, furthermore, similar to the foundation stones of the campanile which were laid down in the ninth century.¹⁸ This evidence enabled Forlati to make a good case for his reconstruction of the early ninth-century church of San Marco as a cruciform building, the ground plan of which corresponded in many respects to that of the present church. The main differences between Forlati's reconstruction¹⁹ and the present ground plan affect the apses,²⁰ which, in the building of the ninth century, had not yet received their articulations with niches and columns; the lateral extent of the transept, which did not include the north and south chapels (Cappella S. Isidoro, Madonna dei Mascoli to the north; Tesoro; Cappella delle Reliquie to the south); and the atrium which cannot have existed at that time—at least not in its present shape²¹—since the outer faces of the walls of the western crossarm show under their present marble incrustation unmistakable traces of having been exposed for a long time to open air.

In particular, the west wall seems to contain parts which may go back to the ninth century. To these may belong the great niche of the main entrance of the church proper, a motif which the builders of San Marco might have borrowed from the so-called Palace of Theodoric at Ravenna and which was used more than once in contemporary architecture, e.g. in Aix-la-Chapelle. The lower parts of the stairs leading up from the entrance niche to the galleries may also belong to the ninth-century structure; the stairs widen at a given point, change direction and, on the south side, even their degree of inclination—an irregularity which suggests that the lower and the upper parts of the stairs belong to different periods. The earlier of these periods may have been the ninth century.

The original crypt must also have been different from that of the present San Marco. According to Cattaneo,²² only the western part of the crypt (now walled up), with two central columns and two side chambers, can be regarded as belonging to the ninth century. It is situated under the central cupola and seems to have formed a sort of raised dais on which the original main altar stood. It is most likely that the roofs or domes of the church were made of wood similar to those of S. Donato in Murano and Sta Fosca in Torcello.²³

¹⁸ G. Boni, "I fondamenti," p. 245 ff.; *idem*, "Il muro di fondazione," p. 355 ff. For the campanile in general, see: *Il campanile*.

¹⁹ F. Forlati, *op. cit.*, p. 76, fig. 78.

²⁰ F. Forlati, "Nuovi lavori," p. 159 ff., fig. 179 f., for the original exterior aspect of the main apse.

²¹ It is true that Johannes Diaconus mentions, in relating the slaying of Pietro IV Candiano in 976 (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 5, no. 40), that the Doge was caught when he tried to escape *per ianua atrii* of the church; but it is likely that this atrium was a small vestibule built on to one of the sides of the church, possibly at the transept, towards the Ducal Palace. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Robert L. Van Nice, of Dumbarton Oaks, for sketches of the two stairs contained within the thickness of the west wall. Mr. Van Nice is not responsible for the deductions that I draw from his sketches.

²² *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 117 f., figs. 8, 9. The same opinion is held by P. G. Paoletti, *Nuovi ritocchi*, p. 9 f. The crypt of the Partecipacii church was altered and enlarged in the eleventh century. That there was a crypt in San Marco prior to the eleventh century (contrary to the opinion of G. Berchet in: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 237 ff.), is proved by the contemporary sources concerning the flight of Doge Pietro Orseolo I which mention the crypt among the places where the search for the missing Doge was carried out (*ibid.* p. 12).

²³ See *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, nos. 49, 56, and, for Byzantine and Western examples, E. Baldwin Smith, *The Dome*, p. 10 ff., and *passim*.

The general layout of the cruciform ground plan and also, perhaps, the emplacement of the main altar in the central square²⁴ connect the Venetian church with that of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. It has been known for a long time, indeed since the time of its construction, that the third church of San Marco, of the eleventh century, followed the model of the Constantinopolitan church; but it is only as a result of Forlati's recent discoveries that a similar relationship can be assumed for the first shrine of the Evangelist. Since, however, the exact architectural features of the ninth-century building are as yet little known, it is not possible to establish by comparison the exact degree of similarity between the two buildings. All we can do, therefore, is to stress the fact that even the first San Marco was, in all likelihood, dependent on the Apostoleion, and to account for this as far as it is possible.

There existed, in fact, both opportunity and motive for the Venetians to use the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople as the model of their state sanctuary. The first was provided by the visits of the Partecipacii to Constantinople and by the close rapprochement of Venice and Byzantium in the ninth century, which resulted in the interest shown by Byzantine emperors in the founding and erection of Venetian churches. Although this interest is not attested for San Marco itself, it is reliably reported in the case of the neighboring church and monastery of S. Zaccaria, and affirmed by tradition for S. Ilario, S. Severo, and S. Lorenzo.

Thus, we need not in our explanation have recourse, to the ubiquitousness of Greek artists, whose presence in the Venetian estuary is, as a matter of fact, attested for the early ninth century.²⁵ The reason the doges chose the church of the Holy Apostles as the model for their first church of San Marco lay in the fact that the latter had to fulfill functions in the religious, dynastic, and political life of the state similar to those of the former: it was a martyrium, an apostles' church, a dynastic chapel, and a state sanctuary. It was, therefore, logical that the Venetians should turn for the prototype of their San Marco, not to the homonymous church of the Evangelist in Constantinople, which is described as a great church with a wooden dome or roof, built by Theodosius I,²⁶ but to Justinian's Holy Apostles. There existed, in addition, an Italian tradition of using cruciform ground plans for apostles' churches, a tradition created

²⁴ This was also the case in St. John of Ephesus and in the Martyrium of Kaoussieh; see *Forschungen in Ephesus*, IV/3, plan, pl. LXVI; *Antioch on the Orontes*, II, plan, p. 219. On the place of the altar in early churches of the Veneto, etc., see G. Brusin, "Il posto." The raised dais in the center of the church, on which the altar stood, may also have been made necessary in Venice by the high water table which forbade the construction of a deep-lying crypt. The same was true in Sta Agata, Grado (P. Paoletti, *op. cit.*, p. 20).

It is possible that the special configuration of the pavement of San Marco, with the so-called "mare" under the central cupola, is a reflection of the original "peribolum" or dais. Cf. the name *θάλασσα* for the same spot in Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.

²⁵ The sources are indicated by H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, I, p. 428 f. (the testament of Fortunatus of Grado, printed in F. Ughelli, *Italia Sacra*, ed. N. Coleti, V, pp. 1101-1103); also R. Cattaneo, *L'architettura*, pp. 47 ff., 239 ff.; and *idem*, *Architecture in Italy*, p. 281 ff.; S. Bettini, "Padova e l'arte," p. 203 ff., esp. p. 251 ff. Sources for the history of Venetian art of the eighth to tenth centuries, also in H. Kretschmayr, *op. cit.*, I, p. 427 f.

²⁶ Near the Taurus, built by Theodosius the Great and rebuilt in the tenth century. See E. B. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 34; a short description in the *Patria*, III, 199, in: *Scriptores*, II (ed. Th. Preger), p. 277.

by St. Ambrose in Milan, when he erected, *ante Portam Romanam*, an apostles' church in *forma crucis*, after the pattern of Constantius' church in Constantinople. It has been pointed out above that the foundation of San Marco was a revival of this tradition, fostered for reasons of ecclesiastic policy.²⁷

The question as to what is left of this first church of the ninth century is difficult to answer. It can be assumed on the strength of Cattaneo's, Marangoni's, and Forlati's researches that part of the outer walls, especially the foundations of the present church and the west wall with the great niche, are remnants of the first building, as is also the western part of the crypt (fig. 20). Great difficulties, however, arise with regard to single items of architectural articulation and decoration which, even if they could be stylistically dated in the ninth century or earlier, might be spoils from other edifices, fitted into their present places in the eleventh century or later. On the other hand, capitals, friezes, and relief slabs of Roman, Early Christian, or early Byzantine date may have formed part of the ninth-century building, for which stones and columns were collected from the ruined edifices of such places as Eraclea, Jesolo, and even from Sicily, if we are to trust the fifteenth-century chronicler Bembo.²⁸

Three types of architectural sculpture may, with all caution, be attributed to the ninth century. The first shows interlaces in stone, of the so-called Longobardic type,²⁹ which may be regarded as products of indigenous art. A second group of totally different design and workmanship, which contains a number of marble slabs patterned in low relief, seems to have been imported from Byzantium or made in Venice by Greek workmen; and the third group consists of Venetian imitations of Greek products.³⁰ The co-existence of indigenous and Greek work, together with imitations of the latter, is characteristic of almost the entire development of Venetian sculpture in the Middle Ages; it is an important fact that this is already true of the ninth century.³¹ The indigenous products are inferior in quality to those made by Greek workmen. Venice had little to give in the ninth century that was her own. Her workmen were at their best when they imitated Greek originals.

There is no other church in Venice proper that, in its present form, could be

²⁷ See *supra*, text p. 5 ff., note 4 ff. For the plan of the Milanese church (later S. Nazaro) see E. Villa, "La Basilica," pl. XXIII and fig. 3. Other cruciform churches dedicated to one or all of the Apostles (Rome, SS. Apostoli; Ravenna, S. Francesco, originally cruciform; Como, SS. Apostoli; Padua, San Prosdocimo; Ephesus, St. John; Gerasa, Church of the Apostles) are mentioned by S. Bettini, *L'architettura*, p. 55 f. On cruciform churches in general, see S. Guyer, "Beiträge"; *idem*, *Grundlagen*, *passim*; *Forschungen in Ephesus*, IV/3, p. 298 ff.; A. K. Orlandos, 'Η σταυρική βασιλική and 'Η ξυλόστεγος βασιλική, I, p. 185 ff. The cruciform type was given preference for important "Martyria" from the fourth century onwards: see A. Grabar, *Martyrium*, I, *passim*; G. Frasson, "Due importanti basiliche."

²⁸ *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 120; *Documenti*, p. 1 f., no. 8. The capitals of San Marco will be the subject of a forthcoming study by Dr. Deichmann; see also G. Mariacher, "Capitelli." A new study of the early transennae, friezes, and reliefs in and around San Marco (of which R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 120 f. counts more than eighty items) is still a desideratum.

²⁹ E.g., *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, fig. 18.

³⁰ The Greek workmanship of some relief slabs (*La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, pls. A and B on p. 122 f.) has been acknowledged by Cattaneo (*ibid.*, p. 120 f.). Contrary to Cattaneo, however, I believe that some of the slabs assigned by him to Greek workmen are copies made by Venetian stone masons, e.g. the one illustrated *ibid.*, pl. A, no. i, on p. 122.

³¹ See also R. Julian, *L'éveil*, p. 12 f.

attributed to the ninth century.³² The only building in the lagoons that contains elements of this period is the cathedral of Torcello,³³ founded in 639/40, rebuilt in the second half of the ninth century, and restored in 1008. It is, however, a basilical building which has nothing in common with the type of architecture to which the first San Marco seems to have belonged. The basilical scheme was the dominant type in a region which, to the very end of the first millennium, remained faithful to the art of the exarchate of Ravenna.³⁴ The ground plan of the first San Marco was an intrusion in this sphere. It was transplanted there from Constantinople in order to emulate the famous martyrium of the Holy Apostles and to resurrect the Ambrosian tradition.

III. THE ORSEOLI CHURCH

The church of the Partecipacii fell victim, 140 years after its completion, to the great fire which ravaged Venice in 976, during the uprising against Doge Pietro IV Candiano. The earliest source to report this fire and the subsequent rebuilding of the church and of the Ducal Palace by Candiano's successors, Pietro Orseolo I and II,³⁵ is the chronicle of Johannes Diaconus, at the beginning of the eleventh century. Dandolo and other chroniclers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries reproduce, almost verbatim, Johannes' statements.³⁶ From these and other sources,³⁷ we know that the church was seriously damaged—so much, in fact, that the inauguration of Pietro Orseolo I had to take place in the cathedral of S. Pietro in Olivolo—but that it was not completely destroyed. The terms *redintegrare*, *redifichar*, *reparare*, *restaurare*, *complere*, seem to indicate that the work done by the Orseoli was, more or less, a restoration of the original church and not a complete rebuilding (*reparavit, ubi combusta erat*). Some of the chronicles say, it is true, that *gran parte della giexia, magna pars ecclesiae*, or *meza la chiexia* was destroyed and it is indeed likely that all the wooden parts were consumed by the fire. But the fact that the Orseoli could defray the cost of rebuilding not only the church but also the palace from their

³² For the Venetian churches of the early period, see P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, pp. 375, 388, note 30; the dates given by G. Marzemin, *Le origini*, especially his theories on the seventh-century ground plan of S. Giacomo di Rialto (p. 257ff., pl. XI), should be viewed with extreme caution.

³³ B. Schulz, *Die Kirchenbauten*; G. Lorenzetti, *Torcello*; M. Brunetti, etc., *Torcello*, with bibliography.

³⁴ S. Bettini, "Padova"; F. Forlati, "L'architettura"; P. Verzone, *L'architettura*; G. Fiocco, "Bisanzio, Ravenna e Venezia"; *idem*, "L'arte esarcale"; *idem*, "Venezia esarcale e Torcello," in M. Brunetti, etc., *op. cit.*, p. 155ff. See also M. Salmi, *A proposito*.

³⁵ Johannes Diaconus (the passage reprinted in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 5, no. 40): ... *unde factum est quod non modo palatium verum etiam sancti Marci sanctique Theodori nec non, sanctae Mariae de Jubinico ecclesiae et plus quam trecente mansiones eo die urerentur* ...; and (*ibid.*, p. 5, no. 41): *Petrus Urseulus dux ... in propria domo degere voluit ut interim Sancti Marci ecclesiam et palatium recreare posset ... Combustum vero palatium et sancti Marci Ecclesiam honorifice propriis sumptibus reintegrare studuit*.

³⁶ The first passage of Johannes Diaconus, quoted in the foregoing note, from *unde* to *urerentur* is to be found verbatim in Andrea Dandolo's chronicle (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 4 no. 37); the last sentence too is almost identical (*ibid.*, p. 5, no. 39): *Combustum palatium et Sancti Marci Ducalem Capellam de suo proprio ad hoc conferens reintegrare studuit*. The fourteenth-century chronicle contains a similar statement: *ibid.*, p. 4, nos. 35, 36.

³⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 4, nos. 27, 28, 30-37, 39-41, 43, 44, 46.

own private means, and that the work was completed within two years,³⁸ seem to indicate that no great damage was done to the structure of the walls and supports.

We have in the present state of our knowledge no indication of whether the reconstructed church of Pietro Orseolo was identical in shape with the church of the Partecipatii. There is, for instance, no proof for Dehio's statement that the Orseolo church was a basilica without transept, vaulted after the pattern of the central bay of Hagia Irene in Constantinople, a statement repeated by Wachtsmuth.³⁹ In any case, the rebuilding of the church by Pietro Orseolo seems to have been a hasty job and the damaged parts were patched up rather than properly repaired.⁴⁰

As to remnants of the Orseolo building, Cattaneo⁴¹ and Gabelentz believed that they had found tenth-century work, mostly Greek, among the capitals, parapets, and other architectural decorations of the present church and consequently ascribed these to the rebuilding of the church under the Orseoli.⁴² These assertions, however, cannot at present be verified. It is, in any case, not very likely that such work should have been undertaken during the short period of rebuilding.

This is about all that can be said about the rebuilding of San Marco at the end of the tenth century.⁴³ We know, however, much more about the next, and, more or less, final rebuilding of the church in the second half of the eleventh century, under Doge Domenico Contarini and his successors (ground plan, fig. 1).

IV. THE CONTARINI CHURCH

I. *Documents and Dates.* Most Venetian chroniclers concur in giving to Doge Domenico Contarini (1042-1071) credit for having begun the building of the third church of San Marco,⁴⁴ to Doge Domenico Selvo (1071-1084) for having continued the work,⁴⁵ and to Vitale Falier (1086-1096) for having completed it.⁴⁶ Some chronicles, however, ascribe the beginning to Domenico Selvo;⁴⁷ one even crediting him with its completion. On the other hand, a number of writers,

³⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 132.

³⁹ G. Dehio-G. v. Bezold, *Die kirchliche Baukunst*, p. 334; F. Wachtsmuth, *Der Raum*, II, p. 178f.

⁴⁰ Bernardo Giustinian's assertion (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 231) that Orseolo rebuilt the church on a larger and grander scale than it had been before, is to be discounted since he clearly confused the Orseolo church with the rebuilding under Contarini and Selvo.

⁴¹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 133ff.; R. Cattaneo, *op. cit.*, p. 318ff.

⁴² H. von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, pp. 63ff., 104ff., 110ff.

⁴³ Pietro Orseolo II in completing the rebuilding of the Ducal Palace begun by his father Pietro I, restored and redecored also the palace chapel, a small sanctuary which is not identical with San Marco and whose identification, by G. Marzemin, *op. cit.*, p. 304, with the present Cappella Zeno rests on insufficient grounds.

⁴⁴ E.g., Magno, based on the chronicle of "Bortolomio Veronese, Abbate de San Nicolo," which, in turn, goes back to an early twelfth-century source. *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 209, no. 811. Most of the other chroniclers also imply that the rebuilding was begun in the time of Domenico Contarini.

⁴⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 5f., nos. 49, 50, 52, 55, 57, p. 210, no. 813.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 5f. nos. 54, 60, 61, 63; p. 210, nos. 812, 814.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 5f., nos. 47, 53, 58, 59, 60.

from the fifteenth century onwards, confusing the second rebuilding of the church with the third, state that the building campaign was begun at the end of the tenth century, and thus make it last for almost one hundred years.⁴⁸ This common mistake, which has been carried down almost to the present time, can be explained by the fact that Venetian tradition perpetuated three dates above all others with regard to San Marco: that of the first foundation in 830; that of the fire in 976; and that of the *inventio* or *collocatio* of the relics of the tutelary Saint, together with the dedication of the church under Vitale Falier at the end of the eleventh century. These dates overshadowed all others, so that it was quite natural for the Venetian chroniclers and historians to link the rebuilding of the church "come ora si vede" ("as it appears today") with its destruction in 976. The desire of the Venetians (already remarked upon by Cattaneo)⁴⁹ to ascribe the earliest possible date to their monuments and institutions, may have had a share in making this error acceptable.

Furthermore, it may have been difficult for the Venetians to account for the third rebuilding, since this was not preceded by any recorded catastrophe. Indeed, there seems to have been no cogent outward reason for rebuilding within less than a century the church which had been restored by Pietro Orseolo. Yet, most profound psychological reasons did exist for the new project: the second half of the eleventh century was, after all, the time, when a great number of Italian cathedrals were built or rebuilt on a grand scale—the cathedral of Pisa, the rival of Venice, being one of them. Civic pride was, perhaps, the most powerful impulse for Venice, which, during this period had become a great maritime power. An inkling of this motive may be read between the lines of the chroniclers, who lay especial emphasis on the grand scale of the new church as against the old one, which they now play down as a small building constructed mainly of wood. This is an exaggeration, because the use of wood was surely restricted to the ceilings and roofs of the ninth-century church; furthermore, the first San Marco seems to have been almost as large as the Contarini church, if one leaves out of account the adjuncts to the main cruciform space and the greater height of the third San Marco.⁵⁰ The concern of the Venetian writers—excluding those who connected the eleventh-century church with the fire of 976—to provide a motive for the new building, can be illustrated by a passage of the sixteenth-century chronicle of Stefano Magno. According to this author, who referred to earlier sources, the Venetians, having a great sum of money at their disposal, deliberated whether they should spend it on war or on rebuilding the church, and the latter proposal prevailed. Whether or not this story is founded on fact, it certainly shows that the building of the church was regarded as a state enterprise, a national demonstration of power, as good as, or even better than, a military campaign. It is, in any case, instructive and even

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 209, no. 806 (Caroldo); p. 230 (Bernardo Giustiniani); p. 245 (G. Stringa); p. 258 (N. Doglioni); p. 273 (G. Meschinello).

⁴⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 153. The error of connecting the building of the Orseolo church (San Marco II) with that of the Contarini-Selvo church (San Marco III), was pointed out in 1859 by P. Selvatico and C. Foucard, *Monumenti*, p. 14.

⁵⁰ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 5, no. 49, p. 6, no. 58, p. 228.

amusing to contrast the Venetian way of accounting for the funds spent on church building with that of the Sicilian monarchs of the twelfth century, who had recourse to such justifications as visions or treasure troves.⁵¹

That the rebuilding of the church in the late eleventh century must be regarded as a new venture, unconnected with the restoration of the Partecipacii church by the Orseoli, becomes patent from the fact that the church continued to be used as the central sanctuary of the Venetian state during the entire first half of the eleventh century. The provincial synod of 1040 was held in San Marco,⁵² and foreign potentates, including Pope Leo IX, visited the church on state occasions. The new project cannot, therefore, have been begun before the middle of the century.

Only one Venetian chronicle gives a definite year for the beginning of the work. It is the Cronaca of Stefano Magno, which, though it was actually composed in the sixteenth century, made use of sources almost contemporary with the building period, especially of the lost chronicle of San Nicolò di Lido. According to Magno there existed annals which dated the beginning of the work in the year 1063,⁵³—which is, incidentally, the very year in which the cathedral of Pisa was begun. Although this date is not as well documented as one would wish, it is likely enough since it accords quite well with other dates concerning certain phases of the rebuilding.

Of the other dates which help to establish the history of San Marco, that of 1071 is especially well documented. Dandolo, whose fourteenth-century chronicle is largely based on earlier evidence, reports that in this year the investiture of the Doge Domenico Selvo took place in the not yet completed (*nondum completa*) church of San Marco, *ad quam perficiendam* [Selvo] *crebro operam dedit*.⁵⁴ The same date was contained in an inscription, now destroyed, but recorded by Sansovino who states that it was engraved on a stone cornice of the atrium: *Anno milleno transacto bisque trigeno/desuper undecimo fuit facta primo*.⁵⁵

The wording of this inscription is well authenticated, but its interpretation is subject to dispute. It has been taken to mean either that the church was begun, or that it was completed in 1071. In fact, it need not mean either, since the inscription may have referred only to work done in a specific part of the church, though it is true that the word *ecclesia* would fit very well the feminine

⁵¹ O. Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily*, pp. 95, 152, notes 56, 57.

⁵² G. Cappelletti, *Storia della chiesa*, VI, p. 43.

⁵³ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 209, no. 811.

⁵⁴ *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 247.

⁵⁵ F. Sansovino, *Venetia*, ed. 1581, p. 30. G. Stringa (*La chiesa*; the passage reprinted in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 245) still saw the inscription in 1610, whereas G. Meschinello (*La chiesa ducale*, p. 9f.; the passage reprinted in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 273) failed to find it in spite of a diligent search. R. Cattaneo (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 181) assumes that the inscription was on the cornice of the right-hand door (Porta San Clemente) leading from the atrium into the interior of the church, a door which was rebuilt in the seventeenth century. The "Raccolta di Facsimili," at the end of the *Documenti* of *La Ducale Basilica*, pl. II, no. 2, contains a misleading picture which purports to reproduce the inscription in question. Actually it is a printer's pasticcio, based on a photograph of an empty, framed slab, found in a grave of the atrium, over which the irresponsible compiler of the Facsimili added the famous inscription. This curious piece of "editing" has already been criticized by Cattaneo (*ibid.*, *Testo*, p. 194, no. 1).

gender of *fuit facta*. The words *facta primo* might be interpreted as "was begun." However, *primo* seems to have been added for metrical reasons and to rhyme with the word *undecimo*. In any case, the inscription shows that work in that part of the church in which it was located had progressed far enough in 1071 for the date to have been recorded there. As the inscription was placed in the southwestern part of the atrium—probably above the right side door (Porta San Clemente) leading from the atrium into the church proper—it must be assumed that work on this part was well under way or even completed at the time. The church as a whole was certainly not yet completed, since it is expressly stated by Dandolo that Selvo was invested that same year in the unfinished church. However, if the church could be used at all, its main structure must have been standing.

If the date of 1063 given by Magno for the beginning of the building is correct, the main structural work must have been done within eight years. This seems to be a brief period within which to build a fairly large and complicated structure on insecure ground. Consequently, a number of authors, including Marangoni,⁵⁶ have preferred to disregard Magno's date and to assume that the building was begun as early as the middle of the eleventh century. However, it has to be borne in mind that, according to Forlati's findings, the building of Contarini was not a completely new structure. Its architects were able to use not only the foundations but also parts of the walls of the Partecipacii church restored by Orseolo and, if some of the Venetian chronicles are to be trusted, also parts of the walls and substructures of old San Teodoro.⁵⁷

It is, indeed, possible that one of the walls of old San Teodoro is still standing—the wall separating the northern transept from the present chapel of Sant' Isidoro. Under the incrustation of this wall were found two barred windows opening southward into the church.⁵⁸ If the attribution of this wall to San Teodoro is correct, it must have been the south wall of the old church, or a part of it. It may later have formed part of the Partecipacii church, the northern transept wall of which may have been the dividing wall common to both churches, San Marco and the still standing and separate chapel of San Teodoro. On this assumption San Teodoro may have been partly demolished in 1063 and incorporated into the Contarini church, whose transept was enlarged to include, on its northern side, part of the area of the first Ducal chapel. This is exactly what Magno says in reporting that in 1063 San Teodoro, which was till then a separate building contiguous to San Marco ("una appresso l'altra"), was demolished ("fo buttà a terra") to become part of the enlarged San Marco ("fo principiada una magna giesia sola a honor de San Marcho").⁵⁹

On the south side a corresponding enlargement took place, perhaps incorporating into the new church part of the old Ducal Palace with the alleged corner tower that now forms part of the Tesoro. Another addition was the atrium,

⁵⁶ L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," p. 12.

⁵⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 6, no. 54; p. 209f., nos. 811, 812.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, *Testo*, pp. 162, 435. The windows were found in 1887.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, *Documenti*, p. 6, no. 54; see also p. 209f., nos. 811, 812.

which does not seem to have existed before, excepting, perhaps, a part of the south wing that may have served as a vestibule to the old church and may be identical with the *ianua atrii* in which, according to John the Deacon, Pietro Candiano was killed in 976.⁶⁰

For the rest, the main innovation made in the rebuilding project of 1063, seems to have been the grandiose brick vaulting as contrasted with the wooden roofs of the old church to which Venetian writers frequently allude ("che in prima giera de parè zoè de *ligname*").⁶¹ It was apparently this vaulting system which made the new church appear to the Venetians as something much grander and even entirely new and different ("in altra maniera") compared to the old building.⁶² To support the new vaults, the walls and piers of the old structure had to be strengthened—though it seems that this was not done thoroughly enough, a shortcoming which was and still is the main source of worry to those responsible for the preservation of the church, and which, as early as the sixteenth century, necessitated the insertion of steel tension rods.⁶³ Another new feature of the Contarini church was the large crypt, excavated and built to the east of the old crypt, in conjunction with the removal of the relics and the main altar from the central square to the presbytery (fig. 20).⁶⁴

Numerous and complicated as these alterations and additions were, a period of eight years seems adequate for the main structural work to have been carried to a point where the church could have been used for state functions without being completed in all its parts.

That work was actually continued after 1071 can be gathered from sources placing the completion of the work in the dogate of Selvo's successor Vitale Falier, and from the well-attested fact that Selvo himself made important contributions to its continuation in his last will. More than one chronicler says that he collected fine marble and other stones for the church and its pavement and began, or even completed, the mosaic decoration of the church.⁶⁵ The latter statement about the completion of the mosaic decoration under Domenico Selvo clashes with the tradition preserved by the Cronaca Agostini, namely, that Selvo in his will left his fortune for this selfsame purpose.⁶⁶ After Selvo's death (1084) work on the church was continued and, it seems, completed, as far as the architectural work is concerned, by his successor Vitale Falier (1084–1096), under whose dogate the consecration of the church and the collocation (*inventio*) of the Patron Saint's relics took place. The alleged dates for the former event vary between 1085 and 1093; those of the latter between 1080 and 1094, the last being the more likely.⁶⁷ But even after 1094 finishing touches had still

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 5, no. 40.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, p. 6, no. 49.

⁶² *Ibid.*, p. 6, nos. 58, 59.

⁶³ E. Zorzi, "I restauri," p. 248.

⁶⁴ R. Cattaneo, *op. cit.*, pp. 116f., 188; a different view was taken by G. Berchet (following P. Saccardo), *ibid.*, p. 237ff., whereas P. G. Paoletti, *Nuovi ritocchi*, p. 9, follows Cattaneo.

⁶⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 6, nos. 49, 50, 52, 53, 56, 60.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 210, no. 813: "Domenico Selvo Doge . . . lassò che la sua facultà fosse per compir li musaichi della chiesa di San Marco nella quale volse esser sepolido, et così fu fatto." However, neither the testament nor the sepulchre of Selvo is preserved.

⁶⁷ See *supra*, bk. I, p. 12, note 39ff., and L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, p. 64f.

to be added before the great work could be considered complete. Quite apart from the decoration with marble and mosaic, which went on as late as the fourteenth century, some fixtures of the church were not added until the first years of the twelfth century: the golden Pala of the main altar in 1105,⁶⁸ and the bronze doors leading from the atrium into the church at some time in the second decade of the twelfth century, since the central door bears a dedicatory inscription of Leo da Molino, who is reported to have been Procurator of San Marco in 1112.⁶⁹

2. *Analysis and Reconstruction.* It must not be thought that the church of San Marco, as it stood completed at the beginning of the twelfth century, looked very much like the elaborate and resplendent building of today. The present aspect of the church is the result of numerous and far-reaching alterations made during the eight and a half centuries that have elapsed since its completion. To arrive at an approximately correct idea of the original form, it would be necessary to remove, as it were, several successive layers of alterations and additions. Any attempt at an accurate reconstruction of the Contarini church is hampered by various difficulties. To begin with, there is hardly any specific historical evidence bearing on the nature and date of the earliest alterations, as far as contemporary or even dependable later sources are concerned. All that these sources offer is evidence of a general kind, from which it may be deduced that more or less extensive work was done in certain periods. Another difficulty is the scarcity of archaeological data. As practically the whole of the building, inside and out, is covered with mosaic and marble incrustation, a thorough investigation of the masonry is impossible. The few complete data that exist were obtained during the restoration campaigns of the last hundred years, and some of these data are not too dependable.⁷⁰ Nor can a theoretical reconstruction of the Contarini church, as it was attempted by Cattaneo and others, be based on the evidence of certain more or less datable types of architectural decoration (mouldings, friezes, cornices, etc.) since such carvings are

⁶⁸ See *supra*, bk. I, p. 23 ff., note 77 ff. The date 1105 is contained in the fourteenth-century inscription of the Pala.

⁶⁹ A. Camesina, "Die Darstellungen"; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 4041.; A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 656; C. Angelillis, *Le Porte*, p. 14f.; L. Einstein, "A Chinese Design," p. 28 ff.; A. Prodocimi, "Le porte," p. 529 ff.

⁷⁰ See, e.g. Cattaneo's (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 166 and *passim*) criticism of the drawings and relevés made during the restoration of the façades in the sixties of the last century. The data, such as they are, are contained *ibid.*, p. 431 ff. (I restauri moderni dal 1797 fino ad oggi [1887]), and the following chapter, *ibid.*, p. 435 f. which brings the story of the restoration up to 1893; *ibid.*, *Documenti*, pls. VIII, IX; *ibid.*, *Portafoglio I*, pls. AA, AA2; A. P. Zorzi, *Osservazioni* (1877); C. Boito, *L'architettura del medioevo* (1880) pp. 299-325; P. Saccardo, "Relazione intorno ai principali lavori ..." (1886); *idem*, *I restauri ... nell'ultimo decennio* (1890); *idem*, *I restauri* (1892); *idem*, *Sommario dei lavori* (1892-95); *idem*, *La basilica di San Marco* (1901); M. Manfredi and L. Marangoni, *Le opere di restauro* (1908); G. Venni, "Come Venezia salva il suo S. Marco" (1932); L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," (1933); *idem*, "Conservazione" (1933); G. Venni, "Per la reintegrazione" (1936); E. Zorzi, "I restauri" (1937), p. 247 ff.; L. Marangoni, *La basilica di S. Marco* (1946); F. Forlati, "Nuovi lavori" (1948), p. 159 ff.; *idem*, "Il primo San Marco" (1951), p. 73 ff.; R. K. Donin, "Österreichische Denkmalpflege" (1954). See also the Appendix by the present Proto of San Marco, Comm. Ing. F. Forlati, who plans to collect the relevant material (casts, drawings, photographs, protocols, etc.) which is now kept partly in the Museo Civico Correr, partly in the Opera di San Marco, and partly in the Studio di Mosaici, in a "Centro di studi Marciani" in San Basso, Venice.

not always *in situ*, having been re-employed and copied again and again in different contexts. Thus the archaizing and *retardataire* tendencies of Venetian art helped to create misleading conditions that are difficult to interpret. The following attempt at a theoretical reconstruction of the state of the church at the end of the eleventh century must, therefore, be regarded as provisional.

As regards the ground plan (fig. 1),⁷¹ most of the area of the present building seems to have been occupied by the church since the late eleventh century. This is also true of the chapels and rooms which are appended to the transept. The north rooms had probably been part of old San Teodoro, though the Cappella S. Isidoro did not receive its present shape until the fourteenth century and the Cappella della Madonna dei Mascoli not until the fifteenth. On the south side of the transept, too, a part of the appendages probably belonged to earlier buildings: the Tesoro was, perhaps, part of the old Ducal Palace—although its walls are not homogeneous—whereas the other small rooms on the south side were added so as to make a straight façade.

Whether the atrium stretched round the northwest and southwest corners of the church, enfolding, as it does today, together with the Baptistry and the old entrance hall (Cappella Zeno) the entire western crossarm, can be judged only after a careful study of the archaeological and stylistic evidence of the façades and of the interior of the atrium itself.

A. ATRIUM, BAPTISTERY, AND CAPPELLA ZENO. The restoration campaigns of the sixties of the last century⁷² and of the second decade of the present century⁷³ provided an opportunity for studying the original masonry and decoration of the north façade of the atrium (figs. 5, 6). Even though some of the drawings dating from the first campaign may not be accurate in all their details, the restorers' drawings and photographs prove beyond any reasonable doubt that there exists behind the marble lining of the later thirteenth century an earlier façade extending from the northwest corner (the "angolo di S. Alipio") to the west wall of the north transept. The general articulation of this earlier façade, with large arched niches between projecting piers, smaller rounded niches and circular "patere" in the piers themselves, and windows, blind arcades, arcuated friezes and pilaster strips in the recessed walls, is similar as far as the architectural "vocabulary" goes, to the articulations of the original west and south façades of the atrium, which are also in part preserved under the incrustation. There are, however, differences in the syntax which governed the arrangement of this vocabulary. The pillars of the north and west façades have two niches each, whereas there are three in the pillars of the south façade. The decoration of the recessed walls is also different; indeed, the walls of the north façade have a more "Romanesque" character than those of the west façade. Certain differences exist also between individual bays of the north façade: the eastern

⁷¹ The ground plan of San Marco, fig. 1, reproduces the true dimensions and thickness of the walls. I should like to thank Signor Forlati for this plan.

⁷² *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 432 f. with a criticism of the methods employed. The water colors by A. Pellanda, made during the restorations and which are now in the Museo Civico, are reproduced *ibid.*, *Portafoglio I*, pl. AA, and *Documenti*, pl. IX. Photographs *ibid.*, pl. VIII.

⁷³ L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," pp. 12 f., 30, note 11, figs. 17-24.

bay, for instance, is treated as a side entrance; its pillars are stronger than the rest and it had sharply *pointed* arches (now hidden behind the rounded arches of the marble incrustation), which are clearly Gothic. Cattaneo's view that these pointed arches were built in the eleventh century and that, consequently, Venice was the first town in Italy to adopt proper ogival arches, cannot, of course, be seriously upheld.⁷⁴ There is also a marked difference in treatment between the architectural forms found in the interior of the north and the west wings of the atrium, both in ground plan and elevation. On the north side (fig. 14) the bays of the north wing are not bounded, as are those of the west wing (fig. 13) by flat or niched walls, but open into semicircular apses which appear to be carved out of the thickness of the wall, though, in fact, they are formed by engaged pillars. The arches that support the cupolas are distinctly pointed, and rest, on the outside, on the pillars that separate the apses. This wing also has high, narrow niches with dentil bands which elsewhere occur only in the thirteenth-century incrustation of the wall between the Zeno chapel and the west wing of the atrium. Gombosi⁷⁵ drew from this the conclusion that the whole north wing of the narthex was built in the thirteenth century.

Startling as this may appear, it seems to be the only possible conclusion. It takes into account the Gothic traits of both the façade and the internal structure of the north wing (figs. 6, 14). When this wing was built, in the first half of the thirteenth century—probably under Doge Marino Morosini († 1253), whose sepulchre in the north wing seems to testify to his active share in the work—the plan of covering the façade with a marble revetment had not yet been conceived. The architect of the newly erected wing had, therefore, the task of devising an architecturally articulated north façade, matching more or less the appearance of the main (i.e. west) façade. The discrepancies which do exist between the thirteenth-century work of the north front and the eleventh-century form of the main façade (fig. 2) are characteristic of the more recent date of the former: the arcuated friezes, the continuous rows of blind windows, and, finally, the fully developed gothic arches of the Porta dei Fiori, could hardly be dated before 1200. As a result of a later adaptation, made in the second half of the thirteenth century, the pointed arches of the Porta dei Fiori were hidden behind a marble revetment with rounded arches; at the same time the Porta della Madonna was given its present shape.

An even later modification concerns the "apse" of the penultimate bay on the north side (fig. 14). In this niche there is a tomb of the fifteenth century containing the remains of Bartolomeo Ricovrati, Primicerio of San Marco. At the time that this tomb was erected, or even later, the original thirteenth-

⁷⁴ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 164: "San Marco è ad ogni modo la prima chiesa d'Italia che abbia sfoggiato archi acuti i quali sono più timidi assai, ma assai più antichi delle famose chiese di Sicilia." Our rejection of an eleventh-century date for the sharply pointed arches of the north façade of the atrium of San Marco does not mean that we do not recognize the possibility of more or less pointed barrel vaults occurring at that time, or even earlier, in Venice and other localities. Cf. for instance, St. Sophia in Ochrid, a church of the early eleventh century. See *Sainte Sophie*, and G. Bošković, *L'art médiéval*, p. 9.

⁷⁵ G. Gombosi, "Il portico," p. 163ff.

century vault of the niche was transformed into a barrel vault. The mosaics adorning this vault date partly from the fifteenth, partly from the seventeenth century. This late vault rests on a double cornice, one part of which is identical with the other cornices of the atrium, while the other is a plastic acanthus frieze with vases, similar to that of the choir chapels and transepts in the interior of the church. The duplication of the cornice is proof of its not being *in situ*.

It would be logical to assume similar conditions with regard to the south wing (fig. 3). There, however, the situation was somewhat more complex. Even if part of the thickness of the walls of the present Tesoro was added later, it is possible that this tower-like structure was already in existence when the first San Marco was built, and that it jutted out westward from the southern transept of the Contarini church, leaving between it and the south wall of the western transept an odd space. This space, together with the Tesoro itself, formed a gamma-shaped complex.⁷⁶ That it was actually used at an early period is shown by the existence of a fragment belonging to an early decoration which was found within the present Baptistery. This is a preparatory drawing ("sinopia") for a fresco and shows part of the drapery of a standing figure in a style which is earlier than twelfth century.⁷⁷

It is unlikely that this enclosed space on the south side of the western crossarm was part of an original, continuous atrium. Indeed, it is certain that such an enfolding atrium was not provided for in the original conception of the eleventh-century church. As can be seen on the south side (figs. 3, 4), the present Baptistery covers a part of the original articulation of the exterior walls of the church. Today one can see only the recessed arches of the large niches which originally decorated the exterior of the church; the niches themselves are now hidden by the roofs of the annexes (fig. 4).

It seems, therefore, that there was no continuous south wing of the narthex or atrium in the eleventh century, just as there existed no north wing. The only difference between the two sides of the church may have been that, next to the ancient tower (the present Tesoro?), there appear to have been some low appendages—perhaps chapels—in one of which the fragment of "sinopia" was found. In the thirteenth century, however, the atrium seems to have been extended along the south side of the church, symmetrically to its extension on the north side. A door may have given access from the new wing to the old corner tower.

The wall separating the present Tesoro from the Baptistery does not seem to have existed prior to 1231 when, after the fire⁷⁸ which devastated the old Tesoro, the present one was installed in a series of rooms attached to the south transept. At an unknown date, the adjoining space began to be used as a baptismal chapel: it is first mentioned as such on the occasion of the funeral in

⁷⁶ R. Cattaneo, in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 163f.

⁷⁷ The fragment, showing the middle part of a standing figure, drawn in reddish brush lines on white mortar, is described in the Museo Marciano as "Frammento di affresco rinvenuto nel Battistero." The surface is quite smooth and shows no traces of "borsette" or "scalette," i.e. trowel marks made in soft mortar for the application of a second layer of stucco to hold mosaic tesserae. It is, therefore, to be assumed that the brush drawing was the groundwork of a painting rather than of a mosaic, which argues for an enclosed and roofed-in space rather than for an exterior wall.

⁷⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, nos. 91-94, 97; p. 211, nos. 824, 825, 828.

1328 of Doge Giovanni Soranzo, who is said to have been buried *in loco puero-rum*,⁷⁹ a term that corresponds to the popular designation of the Baptistery as "Cappella dei putti," the infants' chapel. The early sixteenth-century *Historia di Venetia fino al 1382* of Giangiacomo Caroldo says, on the other hand, that Andrea Dandolo († 1354) was buried "in the portico of the church where there is at present the Baptistery."⁸⁰ Thus, there existed at the beginning of the sixteenth century, a tradition that the Baptistery, had once been part of the atrium or *porticus*. According to Venetian usage, the graves of Soranzo and Dandolo, still extant in the Baptistery, indicate that these two Doges had performed some special service for the Baptistery. We know, in fact, that Andrea Dandolo was the donor of the mosaic decoration. Rafaino Caresini, the continuator of Andrea's chronicle and Gran Cancelliere of the Republic, says so expressly.⁸¹ Dandolo and Caresini are, furthermore, represented as donors in the crucifixion mosaic of the east wall. There is, however, neither a representation of Soranzo in the mosaics nor any mention of his name in connection with the decoration. It must, therefore, be assumed that the special merit to which he owed his sepulchre in the Baptistery consisted in the architectural adaptation of the baptismal chapel. Soranzo was Doge from 1312 to 1328; the adaptation by Soranzo was followed by the mosaic decoration of Dandolo who, if we are to trust Zanotto,⁸² began it during his service as Procurator Scti Marci (from 1331 onwards) before he became Doge in 1343. Thus, the present Baptistery must have been installed in the fourteenth century, having been a part of the atrium in the thirteenth century. Of course, this part of the atrium may have contained a baptismal font from very early times.

Next to the Baptistery, and connected with it by a door, is the former southwest entrance porch, the present Cappella Zeno. It was between the years 1503/4 and 1515 that this room received its present Renaissance shape and became the sepulchral chapel of Cardinal Battista Zeno.⁸³ As a result of this

⁷⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 212, no. 829. On the sepulchre and its inscription see G. Meschinello, *La chiesa ducale*, p. 61 ff. and the guide books.

⁸⁰ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 212, no. 832: (A. Dandolo) "... fo sepolto nel portico della chiesa di San Marco dove hora è il Battisterio." Caroldo must have been well informed since he was Secretary to the Council of Ten. On the monument of Dandolo and its inscription see G. Meschinello, *op. cit.*, p. 61 ff.; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 204; A. da Mosto, *I Dogi*, p. 79 and Appendix. For the stylistic classification of this and the Soranzo Tomb see Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 242 ff. esp. p. 254; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 67 ff. and R. Krantheimer, "Zur venezianischen Trecentoplastik," p. 193 ff. In his testament (V. Lazzarini, "Il testamento," p. 139 ff.; text, after a copy of 1375, on p. 142 ff.) Dandolo requested from the government of the republic and from the procurators of San Marco, that he be buried *pro consolatione anime nostre in Capella Sci Johannis Evangeliste (sic!)* This is probably a slip of the pen on the part of the copyist for *Sci Johannis Baptiste*.

⁸¹ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 212, no. 831: (Dandolo) *iuxta Scum Marcum quiescit in Capella Baptismali quam opere musaico decoravit*. On the mosaics see: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, pp. 305, 366 f., 371 f.; R. Tozzi, "I mosaici"; S. Bettini, *Mosaici antichi*, p. 27, pl. C ff.

⁸² F. Zanotto, *Novissima Guida*, p. 82.

⁸³ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 417 ff.; *Documenti*, p. 17 ff., nos. 122-152. Cardinal Battista Zeno, a relative of Pope Paul II, had left in his testament large sums for pious works, on condition that an elaborate tomb of bronze and marble be erected for him in the south transept of San Marco. However, as it was contrary to tradition for anyone, even a doge, to have a monument, or to be buried in the church proper, this plan had to be modified. A state commission finally decided in 1503 to designate the former southwest entrance hall for this purpose. The bulk of the work was carried out by Alessandro Leopardi and members of the Lombardi family.

adaptation it no longer functioned as an entrance hall set aside from the main body of the atrium, and was separated from the south wing by a wall with a door, and from the west wing by another wall with a monumental doorway. As far as can be determined from the records of Meduna's restoration campaign of 1865 to 1877 (the unfortunate results of which were in part corrected by Berchet and Saccardo in the 1880's),⁸⁴ this porch was, until the sixteenth century, open towards the Piazzetta. It is, however, doubtful whether it was built in this shape at the end of the eleventh century. The over-all design of the pavement in the west wing of the atrium is laid out in two large segments arranged on both sides of the central door which leads into the nave.⁸⁵ Now the segment on the right hand side (south) is incomplete, one quarter of it being cut off by the wall that separates the west wing of the atrium from the present Zeno chapel. This creates a lopsided effect which was certainly not intended by the designer of the pavement. The wall (fig. 13) which so profoundly disturbs the design must, therefore, be later in date than the pavement. On the other hand, in its original shape it cannot have been later than the first half of the twelfth century, because its apse contains mosaics which were made in that period. Another feature provides a corroboration: the apsidal niche does not leave enough flat surface on the west wall to accommodate a door in the southernmost bay of the west façade (figs. 2, 86); instead there is room only for a window. This cannot have been the original state of the façade, which certainly provided for five doorways;⁸⁶ but judging from the columnar decoration framing the porch, the window must have replaced the original door before the façade received its present shape. It was, therefore, certainly after 1100 and before 1150 that the "apse" was built and the southwest Antevestibolo partitioned off from the atrium and vaulted.⁸⁷ The open south arch (which had taken the place of an original apse-like niche) received in the thirteenth century all the trappings of a monumental doorway with lions couchant, columns, etc. (figs. 3, 98). Still later, at the end of the thirteenth century, the apse-like porch which connects the antevestibolo with the atrium proper, was given its present form. Thus, the original ground plan of the atrium seems to have been exactly the same as that of other Byzantine churches: a western narthex, jutting out on both sides of the western crossarm and terminating on either side in a semicircular, apse-like niche. This niche is still preserved on the north side and became the model of the similar niches which were repeated along the north

⁸⁴ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, pp. 432, 434f. The drawings made by Pellanda are reproduced, *ibid.* *Portafoglio I*, pl. AA and *Documenti*, pl. IX.

⁸⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, pl. XXXV (over-all design, after Visentini) and *ibid.*, *Portafoglio II*, pl. XI a, for the section in question. Neither Cattaneo (*ibid.*, *Testo, passim*) nor Urbani de Gheltof (*ibid.*, *Testo*, p. 227ff.) mentions this incongruity.

⁸⁶ See R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 182.

⁸⁷ This hypothesis, far from being invalidated, is further strengthened by the fact that fragments of a terracotta decoration clearly belonging to the eleventh century were found in the walls of the Zeno chapel (L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," figs. 4, 5: "Terracotte rinvenute nelle murature della cappella Zeno"). These fragments were not *in situ*, but were used as building material for the walls which separate the Zeno chapel from the Baptistry and the west wing of the atrium. It is quite probable that they are remnants of the wall or apse which originally closed the great south arch and which became available as building material when this arch was opened up in the early twelfth century.

wall of the north wing of the atrium (fig. 14). Cattaneo regarded all of the present vaults and cupolas of the entire atrium as original eleventh-century structures,⁸⁸ whereas Gombosi assumed that even the west wing was not vaulted until the thirteenth century.⁸⁹ Cattaneo based his belief on an analysis of the form and technique of the friezes, cornices, and bands found at the springing of the arches and the rims of the cupolas, and he was certainly right in ascribing some of them to the eleventh century. He overlooked, however, certain subtle differences within groups of roughly the same type—differences that are clearly noticeable between the friezes of the west and the north wing (figs. 13, 14).⁹⁰ Thus Cattaneo's arguments have to be largely discounted. As to the vaults themselves, those of the north wing must be considered Gothic, as has been said above, owing to their very marked ogival shape, while there is no cogent reason for ascribing (as Gombosi did) the vaulting system of the west wing to the thirteenth century. It is true that the vaults and cupolas of the west wing are structurally not of one piece with the supporting walls. On the west side they rest on broad pillars affixed to the wall and on the inside on columns that have no structural connection with the east wall of the atrium, i.e. the west wall of the church proper. These columns, together with their bases and capitals, are partly spoils of the sixth century,⁹¹ partly mediaeval work⁹² (fig. 22). The date of the latter, as indicated by parallels in San Marco itself and in Torcello, seems to be the late eleventh or the early twelfth century.⁹³ This date is not readily compatible with Gombosi's assumption.⁹⁴ True, the vaults partly block the windows of the staircases,⁹⁵ which are placed in the thickness of the walls, and the architrave above the groups of columns which support the vaults consists of old fragments of cancellae. This, however, cannot be taken as proof that the vaults must date after the late eleventh century because the windows may be part of the ninth-century façade of the Partecipacii church. There is, on the other hand, one vaulted part of the west wing that certainly preceded all the other vaults of the atrium, namely, the apse-like niche of the main entrance, which leads from the atrium into the nave of the church and which dates most probably from the ninth century (figs. 11, 13). Its details, including the "niello" friezes and capitals, the mosaics, and the bronze door, show, it is true, the style of the eleventh century.

⁸⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, pp. 164f., 179ff.

⁸⁹ G. Gombosi, *op. cit.*, p. 163f.

⁹⁰ The tendrils of the frieze at the foot of the lunettes in the north wing, while adopting the general pattern of those of the west wing, are entirely different as to sculptural technique and character. Those of the west wing are to a large extent sharply-cut patterns, compressed, as it were, between two planes, the groundplane and the surface of the flat, engraved relief. Those of the north wing, on the other hand, show tendrils in boldly-rounded relief against a flat background. The effect of the former is coloristic, that of the latter sculptural.

⁹¹ R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 179; e.g. *Dettagli*, pls. 193, 199 C 5, 203 E 3. On the place of some of these capitals in Byzantine art see E. Kitzinger "The Horse and Lion Tapestry," Appendix, p. 61ff. (nos. 24-28, 44, 69-72, 87-90).

⁹² *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, e.g. pls. 107 C 2, 194 B 4, 198 C 3, 206. On mediaeval imitations of sixth-century capitals see E. Kitzinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, 49, 60, and G. Mariacher, "Capitelli," p. 43ff.

⁹³ See O. Demus, "Zwei Dogengräber."

⁹⁴ G. Gombosi, *op. cit.*

⁹⁵ See also *supra*, p. 66.

But it has no structural connection with the other vaulted parts and its horizontal cornices are not continued in the rest of the atrium. The entire niche is, in fact, a foreign body of earlier date, encased within a wholly different system of architecture. Its height dwarfs the flanking barrel vaults. When the other vaults were built, it could have been preserved only by a desperate operation, the insertion of a curious shaft, the famous "pozzo," one of the most puzzling creations of mediaeval architecture, which opens through the ceiling of the atrium in front of the entrance porch and provides a most unexpected view into the great west vault of the church above. Cattaneo⁹⁶ was of the opinion that the pozzo, together with the vaults of the atrium, belonged to the original building of the eleventh century; Bettini⁹⁷ believes that the pozzo was broken through in the Gothic period and Forlati⁹⁸ inclines to the same view. Actually, it cannot be separated from the rest of the vaulting system of the west wing. It was made necessary by the existence of the ninth-century niche, and is paralleled by similar shafts in the interior of the church.

To sum up: the present atrium with the Cappella Zeno, the Baptistery, and the Tesoro, are the product of a series of modifications. The original vestibule was, as far as can be determined, a narthex of Byzantine form, stretching along the west wall of the church, projecting at either end and terminating in lateral apses. Soon after its completion, the south end of the narthex seems to have been partitioned off and given the shape and function of an open entrance hall. In the first half of the thirteenth century, the vestibule was extended so as to enfold the entire western arm of the church.⁹⁹ In the reign of Doge Giovanni Soranzo, part of the south wing was made into a Baptistery. Certain minor alterations were also carried out in the fourteenth century. Thus the windows in the west and north wings of the atrium were remodelled under Bartolomeo Gradenigo, who, perhaps for his share in this work, was given burial in the north wing.

B. INTERIOR. The architecture of the interior of San Marco (figs. 12, 15-19) has undergone no fewer changes than that of the atrium. These alterations account for most of the exceptional features that make San Marco such an enigmatic building. Three considerations were, in the main, responsible for the major alterations which the building underwent from the period of its completion to the present day: considerations of structural stability, considerations of lighting, and considerations of decorative embellishment.

Structural changes were made necessary by the slipshod technique used in

⁹⁶ R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 164.

⁹⁷ S. Bettini, *L'architettura*, p. 250.

⁹⁸ Personal letter of November 27, 1950.

⁹⁹ R. Cattaneo (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 169f.) believed, as has been pointed out above, that the entire atrium, including the upper story of the north wing, was built and vaulted in the eleventh century. In order to support this hypothesis he had to interpret the upper windows in the north wall of the church's western crossarm, which had become useless and were walled up when the upper rooms of the north wing of the atrium were built, as doors, which, according to his theory, connected the rooms of the atrium's upper story with the galleries of the church's interior. This hypothesis cannot be defended because there are three openings instead of one; they have the same shape and location as the windows in other parts of the church; and, finally, they are too high up in the wall to have been used as doors.

building the pillars and vaults of the church. Not so very long after the completion of the church, certain strengthening operations appeared necessary in order to counteract the outward thrust of the cupolas. Strengthening arches had to be inserted in the transverse barrel vaults of the eastern crossarm (fig. 17) and in the outer vault of the north transept.¹⁰⁰ This must have been done prior to the decoration of these vaults with mosaic.¹⁰¹ Another strengthening arch rising on twin columns was inserted in the fifteenth century in the south transept (fig. 12) in order to make up for the loss of stability caused by the opening of the great rose window in the south wall.¹⁰² This procedure ruined the old mosaics of the arch and of the cupola spandrels next to the south wall and left little space for the new ones of the seventeenth century.

None of the repairs which were necessitated by earthquakes, fires, and the static deterioration of the structure altered the architectural character of the church, though they wrought havoc among the mosaics.

The greatest change in the original aspect of the interior was due not to work undertaken for structural reasons, but to the removal of the upper galleries, at least those parts of them which were situated above the aisles of the western, southern, and northern crossarms. That the narrow "catwalks" (figs. 15, 18, 19) which are today a distinguishing feature of San Marco cannot have been planned in their present form in the eleventh century has been acknowledged by almost every author who has written on the church.¹⁰³ Selvatico even went so far as to assume that the very arcades that separate the naves from the aisles were added later to the original structure, which, according to his hypothesis, was unencumbered by columns and arcades, very much like Saint-Front in Perigueux.¹⁰⁴ This view has rightly been criticized by Cattaneo,¹⁰⁵ whose arguments can hardly be refuted. In fact, the proof that the arcades were part of the original structure is still there for everybody to see. However, these arcades did not originally support narrow corridors which wind precariously round corners and are hardly wide enough to permit people to pass by each other, but supported full-sized galleries which extended from the arcades to the outer walls, in which the wooden beams that upheld the wooden floors were anchored. That this was indeed the original form can be seen from the old entrance doors to the galleries which are still preserved, though partly walled up, in the west wall of the church. Stairs lead from these doors to the level of the galleries; but these stairs now end abruptly at the balustrades, whereas originally they opened on the middle axes of the galleries. The removal of the gallery floors led, furthermore, to thoroughly absurd and makeshift solutions which could never have been part of the original plan. In order to make circulation at all

¹⁰⁰ P. Selvatico and C. Foucard, *Monumenti*, p. 51 ff.; R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 159.

¹⁰¹ Unfortunately no *terminus post quem* for the mosaics can be derived from this architectural feature since no firm date can be established for the strengthening of the vaults, which may have become necessary soon after the completion of the church.

¹⁰² This arch is not made of brick as are all the others, but of Istrian limestone.

¹⁰³ See, however, P. O. Rave, *Der Emporenbau*, p. 32, who thinks the present form original.

¹⁰⁴ P. Selvatico and C. Foucard, *op. cit.*, p. 51 ff.

¹⁰⁵ R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 159 ff.

possible along the passages, consoles had to be attached to the walls and pillars at certain corners (figs. 19, 23, 97), while in the upper story of the hollow piers, corners and vaults had to be cut away. It also became necessary to erect balustrades along the outside of the passageways, parallel to the old parapets which existed on the side facing the nave. The new balustrades, which are higher than the old, consist of octagonal and square columns with roughly carved capitals; these carry arches and are topped by simple cornices and, at intervals, by stone balls. In general shape and even in most of their details they are similar to the balustrades of the façade. Most of the balustrades rest on richly carved friezes and a corbel table with human or animal heads as supports. Friezes and corbel tables also gird the main walls of the church; apart from their decorative function they served to cover up the former supports and the holes left after the removal of the original floor beams.

Both the columnar balustrades and their supports are entirely different in style from the original architectural and plastic details of the eleventh century. They are definitely Romanesque; some are even late Romanesque. The protomes of the corbel table provide the most easily datable characteristics. They portray a variety of animals, mostly bulls and griffons; but the great majority of the protomes are human heads, both male and female, some bearded, others crowned. Some of them still show traces of gilding. Whereas most of the heads attached to the main walls have parallels in early Romanesque art, others, especially those within the piers, are masterly products of later artistic currents. These latter are tinged with the classicism of the early thirteenth century, which is ultimately French and stands in contrast to the archaic stylization of earlier periods. The precursors of these Venetian protomes are the caryatid heads of the former "Pontile" of Modena Cathedral, of the second half of the twelfth century.¹⁰⁶ But better parallels are even nearer at hand, among them the head of the angel on the northwest pier of the central cupola (fig. 100).¹⁰⁷ It has the same solid cubic shape, the same summary modelling, with a broad, triangular nose projecting vigorously from a rather flat face, the same large mouth drawn in at the corners, with a pouting lower lip. Other heads correspond exactly to those on the first and second arch of the main portal of the west

¹⁰⁶ A. Venturi, *Storia*, III, figs. 247-250; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 186 ff.; G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, I, p. 47 ff., II, pl. 48.

¹⁰⁷ *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 275; *Dettagli*, pls. 236, M 5, M 6; pls. 376, ZA 4; H. von der Gabelentz, *Geschichte*, p. 157 (who suggests a thirteenth-century date); A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 515 ff. (figs. 360-363), thought the figures of the angels "Byzantine," possibly taken from the Pantocrator church in Constantinople, a view for which there is not a shred of evidence. Venturi was taken to task for this by M. Dvořák (review in *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, II [1905], p. 19, reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, p. 328), who pointed out the stylistic differences between the two groups and characterized the figures as North Italian, late twelfth or early thirteenth century. E. H. Buschbeck, *Der Portico*, p. 39, connected the San Marco angels with the angel of the Toulouse Annunciation, of the late twelfth century, and saw a direct line of evolution from the San Marco angels to Rheims; he was followed in this by A. Kingsley Porter, *Romanesque Sculpture*, I, text, p. 244 and pls. 480-483, who, however, continued to call the San Marco angels "Byzantine." P. Toesca, *Storia*, pp. 802 f., 897, regards the angels as works of the "scuola bizantineggiante" of Venice; R. Jullian, *ibid.*, p. 288, pl. XCV, 1 and 3, differentiates between the two groups (as did Toesca) and speaks of the "rencontre de l'art antelamique avec l'art byzantin de Venise." G. de Francovich, *op. cit.*, p. 264, though excluding Venetian sculpture from his treatment of the Antelamesque school—this is to be reserved to a special volume—classes the angels, on p. 464, as Ducentesque. See also *infra*, pp. 119, 156.

façade. On the strength of this evidence it cannot be doubted that many of the protomes of the aisles are products of the same workshop as other parts of the sculptural decoration of San Marco, which, as will be seen later, can be dated in the first and second quarters of the thirteenth century.

This date is corroborated by another consideration. We know exactly what the style of sculpture was like in the seventies of the twelfth century, when Niccolò dei Barattieri erected the two columns of the Piazzetta. The corner decorations of the bases of these columns are excellent examples of the vigorous primitivism of this period, with strong plastic shapes expressed through cubic masses.¹⁰⁸ This primitivism, which was inspired by Lombard sculpture, must antedate at least by one generation the highly developed sense of plastic differentiation, which manifests itself in the latest protomes of the aisles. Their date must be well after 1170; the parallels with the sculptures of the main portal point to about 1230 as the date of the termination of the work. Thus we have two different sets of protomes, one belonging to the twelfth, the other to the early thirteenth century. From this it may be deduced that the removal of the galleries was carried out in two campaigns, the first affecting the main aisles of the west, north, and south crossarms, the second the tribunes within the piers. The situation is less clear in the side chapels of the presbytery, the Cappelle San Pietro and San Clemente, in the eastern part of which the galleries rest on the apses and on massive barrel vaults, whereas the western parts of the chapels may never have been covered by galleries. Noticeable irregularities in the arch between the Cappella San Pietro and the main presbytery might suggest that the western part of the choir chapels was also originally vaulted. What could be interpreted as the remnants of a cross-groined vault, are still visible. However, it is likely that the broadening of the arch, which is decorated with the mosaic figures of Pope Pelagius and Patriarch Elias of Grado, was solely designed to furnish a more solid support for an organ, or simply, to broaden the corridor which leads from the galleries of the transepts to those of the choir chapel.¹⁰⁹

Differences in form suggest in fact that the openings in the side chapels—which resemble the pozzo of the atrium—were either broken through at a considerably earlier date than those of the aisles,¹¹⁰ or even that they belong to the original concept of the eleventh-century architects. They have neither corbel tables nor protomes and the balustrades are noticeably different from those of the rest of the church.¹¹¹ The side chapels, one of which (San Clemente)

¹⁰⁸ See *infra*, p. 117 f.

¹⁰⁹ See also R. Cattaneo in: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 161 f.

¹¹⁰ It has been suggested that this was done after the alleged fire of 1145. See, however, *infra*, note 116.

¹¹¹ The friezes surrounding the interior of the "pozzi" of San Pietro and San Clemente, which consist of a sculptured band with vases flanked by acanthus palmettes (dated by R. Cattaneo, *op. cit.*, p. 187, and by G. Lorenzetti, *Venezia*, p. 191, in the ninth century, and regarded as remains of the Partecipacii church) seem in fact to be remnants of an older decoration. This type of frieze is to be found, disconnectedly, in the south transept (west and east walls), in one of the apsidal niches of the atrium's north wing (under the second cupola from the east end), and in Torcello (exterior of the cathedral, north wall). As the transept walls and the north wing of the atrium of San Marco received (as will be shown further on) their marble incrustation in the thirteenth century, these remnants of an earlier

seems to have been the exclusive domain of the doge, may have been conceived as two-storied chapels, a frequent architectural formula for seigneurial chapels (figs. 16, 17).¹¹²

Originally the galleries surrounded the whole interior, with the exception of the main apse, where the circuit was continued on the outside. As a result of the changes just described, the galleries were almost abolished, or at least greatly reduced in the aisles. At the north and south ends of the transept, however, where they were supported by the vaults of the chapels, and at the west end of the western crossarm, the galleries retained their original floor space.

The key to the problem of the far-reaching alterations which gave San Marco its present character, seems to be this: at some time, after the completion of the church, drastic measures for the improvement of the lighting conditions must have become necessary. The reason for this can only have been that the illumination of the church by its original fenestration had undergone a change which obscured the interior. It can be seen from a comparison of the exterior and the interior walls of the church that a good number of the windows are, at present, blind and covered with mosaics on the inside (figs. 3, 4). They must have been walled up before the mosaics were made; it can even be said that they had to be walled up in order to provide sufficient wall-space for the mosaic decoration. Originally, with the exception of the east apse, every one of the tympana-shaped walls of the arms of the cross (eleven in all) was to a large extent cut up by windows, of which there were probably eight in each wall,¹¹³ but none of the original groups of windows has remained intact. Apart from still later changes,¹¹⁴

decoration cannot be *in situ*; they were re-employed by the thirteenth-century decorators. The characteristic form of the balustrade of the side chapels is to be found in S. Donato, Murano, of the first half of the twelfth century.

¹¹² From the ninth to the thirteenth centuries there existed a widespread architectural habit of building seigneurial and palatine chapels in two stories. Some of the German "Doppelkapellen," especially the rectangular ones, have openings in the floor of the upper story which are very similar in idea and execution to the pozzis of the Marcan side chapels. See O. Schürer, "Romanische Doppelkapellen," p. 99ff. (bibliography, p. 109f.): Mainz, St. Godehard (p. 113, fig. 4); Goslar, St. Ulrich (p. 124, fig. 14); Landsberg, castle (p. 145, fig. 34); Nürnberg, Palatine Chapel (p. 162f., fig. 52f.); Eger, Palatine chapel (p. 167, fig. 56); Freiburg, Neuerburg (p. 175, fig. 63); Rheda, castle (pp. 177, 179, figs. 64, 67). Examples outside Germany are to be found in Bohemia and Scandinavia.

¹¹³ As the north and south walls of the transept were completely reshaped at a later period, the original number of windows in these walls cannot be determined with certainty. Equally uncertain is the number of windows in the west walls of the transepts. There are, however, traces of eight windows in the east wall of the north transept, which correspond in size and shape to those in the west walls, so it is likely that there were eight windows in each wall. On the fenestration of San Marco see: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, pp. 163f., 169, 207, 211, and the chapter in S. Bettini's *L'architettura*, p. 255ff., esp. 260.

¹¹⁴ In all likelihood, the windows of the north wall of the transept were completely closed prior to the execution of Vincenzo Bianchini's Tree of Jesse (1542-1551) in order to provide sufficient wall space for this gigantic mosaic. Those of the south wall were destroyed when the Gothic rose window was opened up after the middle of the fifteenth century (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 202; the rose was restored in 1821). The reduction of the groups of windows in the west and east walls of the south transept to three each was effected in 1641 (*ibid.*, p. 211). The circular window in the south wall of the S. Clemente chapel seems to date from the fifteenth century. The present state of the fenestration is as follows, beginning with the west wall of the western crossarm and proceeding clockwise around the church: west wall, large semicircular window; north wall of west bay, none; west wall of north transept, three, partly obscured by the roof of the atrium's upper story; north wall of north transept, none; east wall of north transept, five; north wall of S. Pietro, four; apse, three; south wall of S. Clemente, one circular window; east wall of south transept, three (enlarged); south wall of south transept, one circular window; west wall of south transept, three (enlarged); south wall of west bay, six.

the groups of eight windows in each wall were, in the period that concerns us, reduced to six, five, four, and three, or walled up completely; the latter measure became necessary for the windows in the north wall of the western cross-arm because of the erection of the vaulted rooms above the north wing of the atrium.

The walling up of so many windows in order to make room for the mosaics—and there can be no doubt that this was, in fact, the reason for closing a large number of windows—must have had a profound effect on the distribution of light in the church. The interior, previously well lit by a harmoniously arranged fenestration, must have been considerably darkened after this operation. The aisles under the galleries especially must have become completely obscured; sooner or later the gallery floors had to be removed in order to let the dimmed light of the reduced windows penetrate to the ground level.

Thus, the adoption of a vast program of mosaic decoration and the consequent reduction of the number of original windows were the causes of the eventual removal of the galleries.¹¹⁵ All these separate operations, including the different kinds of plastic articulations, were consequently part of one great scheme, the primary aim of which was to restore the lighting conditions of the church. The operation may already have appeared necessary when the mosaic decoration was begun; it became indispensable as soon as the decoration was completed.

If the intrinsic connection between the architectural changes and the mosaic decoration is realized, everything falls into place. Instead of a series of disconnected operations, we see one great campaign, carefully planned and consistently carried out. This campaign had nothing to do with damages allegedly caused by a fire which was by some authors thought to have devastated "the beauty and rich ornamentation of San Marco and the Ducal Palace" in 1145. This date which has found its way into more than one book on San Marco, is based on a scribe's error in the fifteenth-century Bemba chronicle. The chronicle quite correctly connected the fire with the time of Ordelaaffo Falier (1102–1118) and approximately with the date of the consecration of the church, but added, as a heading, the erroneous date "MCXXXXV."¹¹⁶ As a matter of fact, there was no fire in 1145; the report of the Bemba chronicle concerns a fire which happened in 1106, at the time of Ordelaaffo Falier and not long after the consecration of San Marco. This fire of 1106 is well attested and correctly dated by Andrea Dandolo's chronicle, where it is described as having damaged a great number of churches (including all those mentioned by Bemba) *cum*

¹¹⁵ This is also the opinion of S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, pp. 83, note 3, and 256f. He sees an additional (and parallel) reason for the removal of the gallery floors in the fact that the heightening of the superstructure of the cupolas, with its consequent thickening of the drums, caused a diminution of the direct light admitted by the cupola windows. To the changed taste of the late Gothic period the lighting conditions created in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries seemed again inadequate; hence the opening of the two rose windows in the south walls and of the great lunette in the west wall.

¹¹⁶ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 8, no. 74, "... non perdonando la furia del fuoco ne alla bellezza, ne ai richissimi ornamenti della chiesa di San Marco, ne al Palazzo Ducale, etc. Fu anco in questi tempi consacrata la chiesa di S. Marco adl 4 Ottobre." (*Chronica Bemba, dalla fondazione della città sino al 1413*). The "fire of 1145" figures in, among other works, L. Marangoni's "L'architetto," p. 11, and G. Lorenzetti's *Venezia*, p. 188.

*aliqua parte Cappellae et Palatii Ducalis.*¹¹⁷ Whatever damage was done to San Marco by the fire of 1106, it certainly had no connection with the great campaign which was undertaken solely in order to prepare the interior for the extension of its mosaic decoration and to restore the lighting conditions that were impaired by this decoration.¹¹⁸

3. *Character of the Contarini Church; San Marco and the Apostoleion* It was primarily this campaign which altered the aspect of San Marco as it had appeared at the end of the eleventh century. If these alterations are discounted, the eleventh-century church of Contarini reveals itself as a cruciform building (fig. 1) with five cupolas of somewhat unequal size, the central and western cupolas having a diameter of ca. 13 metres, those of the presbytery and transepts of ca. 10–11 metres. All cupolas with the exception of that above the western arm are slightly elliptical; the central cupola is an ovoid, its diameter being about one metre shorter from west to east than from north to south. The cupolas are supported by quadripartite piers and by the corners of the solid walls, strengthened in the transepts by arches resting on twin columns. The twin columns and arches serve also to narrow and lower the space of the transepts and the presbytery. Each dome is buttressed by lateral barrel vaults, the easternmost vault being the narrowest, since there the eastward thrust of the presbytery cupola is neutralized by the semidome of the apse. The space spanned by the lateral barrel vaults is screened off by arcades, thus forming two side aisles in each of the crossarms. In the eastern arm, the place of the aisles is taken by side chapels with apses carved out of the thickness of the east wall, while the main apse forms a nine-sided protrusion. The aisles of the western, northern, and southern crossarms were divided horizontally by the wooden floors of the galleries. These galleries extended around the entire circumference of the church with the exception of the main apse, where a connecting link was provided by an exterior passage. At the north and south ends of the transepts, the galleries rested, as in the eastern halves of the choir chapels, on solid vaults, erected over side entrances and corner rooms; the wooden floors of the other parts were supported by colonnades of three columns each in the western arm and two each in the arms of the transept.

This magnificent structure was lit by sixteen windows in each of the five cupolas, three or seven windows in the apse and probably eight in each of the lunette-shaped outer walls. The light was strongest in the upper reaches of the nave; the aisles beneath the galleries remained in comparative darkness, serving as a striking contrast to the well-lit main body of the church. Under the raised presbytery there was, and still is, a crypt, 22 metres long and 27.7 metres broad, with three apses to the east and niches in its walls. Its vaults are supported by fifty-six columns (fig. 20). The western crossarm of the church was preceded by a narthex. The inner surfaces of the building were enlivened by niches, moulded arches, and engaged columns of brickwork—a decoration

¹¹⁷ *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, col. 260.

¹¹⁸ Thus also S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, p. 255 ff.

parts of which have come to light during the restoration campaigns of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (fig. 21)¹¹⁹—and with a few cornices, ornamented in relief and inlay. This original aspect of their church was remembered by the Venetians even in later times.¹²⁰ The most elaborate adornments of this severe brick structure were the columns of the arcades, the capitals and the numerous marble transennae which formed the parapets of the galleries, and the enclosures of the altars.

The exterior aspect of the church has changed even more than that of the interior. The cupolas were lower than they are now and the cruciform shape of the main body of the church appeared in all its stereometric purity since it was not encumbered by the side wings of the atrium. It was practically unadorned and accentuated only by windows and niches. The only parts of the exterior that had a richer decoration were the apse and the façade of the narthex. The latter was composed of a series of tall niches between protruding pillars, all of equal height. Blind arcades and windows were set in the back walls, while the faces of the pillars were enlivened by flat and semicircular niches, some of them filled with mosaic, and with circular slabs of marble or other precious stone (*patere*).¹²¹ To the right of the main entrance the yardarm of a lateen-rigged ship—a trophy of one of the naval victories of the Venetians—was found attached to the original brick wall.¹²²

Such was the building as it looked after its completion. To see it, as it was then, would give the beholder a certain shock. He would miss the soft color of the marble incrustation, the glitter of the mosaics, and, on the façade, the gay trimmings of later periods. He might also feel a discrepancy between the “idea” of the building and the way it was executed, or, to put it another way, between the body of the church and its skin. The idea—the ground plan and its spatial realization—was certainly Greek; the surface relief of both the interior walls and the façades—not to speak of the motley details—was Italian. This was noticed long ago, by Cattaneo amongst others, who concluded from this discrepancy that the chief architect who designed the plan was a Greek, whereas the masterbuilder who put the design into execution and soon supplanted the originator of the plan, was an Italian from the Romagna.¹²³ There is certainly some truth in this, even if Cattaneo’s identification of the Italian master with the Mazulo named in an inscription of Pomposa has to be taken *cum grano salis*. The Italian details, the western brick technique with very thin layers of mortar, and the Romanesque character of the niche-architecture argue very strongly indeed for the assumption that the execution of the building was largely in the hands of Italians. This is, after all, what is to be expected: it is hardly likely that an entire workshop, large enough to cope with such a huge task down to the least detail, should have been transplanted to Venice from abroad. But it is

¹¹⁹ L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, figs. 26–30 (interior), figs. 24, 25 (atrium).

¹²⁰ Chronicle of Scivos, in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 6, no. 51.

¹²¹ *La Ducale Basilica, Portafoglio I*, pls. AA, AA2; L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, figs. 16–23, 42–44; C. Boito, *Architettura*, figs. 31, 32 on p. 312f.; P. Selvatico, *Gli antichi prospetti*.

¹²² *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 435, and P. Saccardo, *I restauri nell'ultimo decennio*, p. 49.

¹²³ R. Cattaneo in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, pp. 154, 179. See also H. Rathgens, *San Donato*, p. 5.

equally certain that the leading spirit, the chief architect, did come from Byzantium. Even to this day, the chief architect of San Marco has retained his Greek title, "il Proto"; popular legend identified as the portrait of the first architect the figure of a lame old man, carved in relief in one of the archivolts of the central porch, and called him a Greek (fig. 80).¹²⁴ But we need not rely on traditions of this kind: Sansovino and Giustinian, who used dependable sources, affirm that the chief architects came from Constantinople.¹²⁵ The most important testimony, however, can be traced back to a source almost contemporary to the erection of the Contarini building. It is contained in the *Translatio Sci Nicolai*, composed by a monk of S. Nicolo di Lido soon after 1100, and states that under the dogate of Vitale Falier the church of San Marco, which had been begun by Domenico Contarini, was completed "in a construction similar to that of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople."¹²⁶ This passage was copied verbatim by Corner in 1749; but a hundred years earlier, Stefano Magno incorporated in his *Annali* an almost identical passage, allegedly taken from the fifteenth-century chronicle of Bartholomew, Abbot of San Nicolo. Thus, both traditions point to the monastery of S. Nicholas on the Lido and go back, in fact, to one and the same source. The authenticity of this source as a document almost contemporary with the building itself cannot be doubted. It was, therefore, known at the time and regarded as a fact worthy of being set down in writing, that the new building of San Marco, begun under Contarini and completed under Vitale Falier, was built after the model of the Apostoleion.

¹²⁴ E.g. Nicolò Doglioni (1662), in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 260; Magno *ibid.*, p. 6, note 55.

¹²⁵ F. Sansovino, *Venetia* (1581), p. 30; B. Giustinian, *De origine*, in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 230: *Templi autem instauratio magnificentior decreta quam antea fuerat ... accitis igitur ex Constantinopoli primariis architectis; templum instaurari et ampliari qua poterat coeptum ornatus quidem et artificium magnitudinem longe superavit.* It is true that Bernardo Giustinian ascribes this rebuilding to Pietro Orseolo, but it is clear from the context that he is speaking of the Contarini church. G. Meschinello, *La chiesa*, I, p. 11 f., follows Sansovino in affirming that the architects came from Constantinople.

¹²⁶ The passage contained in *Monachi Anonymi Littorensis Historia de Translatione Sanctorum Magni Nicolai*, etc., printed in *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, Historiens occidentaux*, V/I, p. 284 (1094) runs: *Regnante itaque Vitale Faletro, Veneticorum duce egregio, consummata est Venetiae ecclesia evangelistae Marci, a Domenico Contareno, duce nobilissimo fundata, consimili constructione artificiosa illi ecclesiae quae in honorem duodecim Apostolorum Constantinopolis est constructa.* The *Translatio* is preserved in five manuscripts (two in Rome, three in Venice), the earliest of which (Bibl. Marciana, Cod. lat. IX, 28) is of the twelfth century. One of the Venetian copies of the *Translatio* must have been seen by F. Corner, who copied verbatim the passage referred to in his *Ecclesiae Venetae* (1749), IX, c. 32 (reprinted in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 210, no. 814) and stated that a chronicle written by the abbot Zeno of San Nicolo contains exactly the same words. This chronicle seems to be identical with the *Translatio*. A passage in the *Annali* of Stefano Magno († 1572), which reads: "In tempo de questo doxe [Dom. Contarini] fo fundado la giesia nuova de San Marcho, Capela Duchal, a simile construcionione artificiosa come quella, che in onor dei XII Apostoli in Constantinopoli è constructa. Questo scrive Bartolomeo Veronese Abbate de San Nicolo esser stato in tempo de questo doxe al tempo che quello etiam edificò el monastier de San Nicolo" (from the Raccolta Cicogna in the Museo Civico, cod. 266, vol. 2, c. 113, reprinted in: *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 209, no. 811), is derived ultimately from the same source. Bartolomeo of Verona, Abbot of San Nicolo, lived in the fifteenth century. His chronicle, evidently based on the *Translatio*, is lost, but was extant in San Nicolo in the seventeenth century. (L. Marangoni, *op. cit.* p. 26). There is no reason for thinking that the part of the *Translatio* in which this passage occurs (*Miracula*) was added later to the main body of the work. All the "miracles" referred to in this part took place in the eleventh century or the first years of the twelfth, when the passage was written. The crucial word in the source, *consimile*, is quite in keeping with the mediaeval terminology referring to copying. W. Haftmann, in dealing with this terminology (in a review of O. Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Schriftquellen*), has collected a number of similar passages.

From this statement, however, to a definition of the exact relationship between the two buildings, there is a long way to go. It is, moreover, not within the scope of the present study to explore every detail of this relationship. The church of the Holy Apostles was destroyed soon after the Turkish conquest of Constantinople and replaced by the two successive buildings of the Fatih Camii, the mosque of Mehmed II. This church of the Apostles was the second of its name. The first, projected by Constantine and completed by Constantius, a cruciform building with wooden roofs or cupolas,¹²⁷ had made way for Justinian's five-domed church in the second quarter of the sixth century.¹²⁸ This was, essentially, the building that existed in the eleventh century and that became the model for San Marco. It had certainly been restored and redecorated in the meantime, but its architecture was that of the sixth century. The assumption of a substantial alteration of the Holy Apostles in the tenth century has no basis whatsoever.¹²⁹

For a hypothetical reconstruction of this Apostles' church we have, to begin with, a number of written sources. The most important are a poem by Constantine of Rhodes and a prose description by Nicholas Mesarites; further details are furnished by Procopius and the Book of Ceremonies of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.¹³⁰ Some help in visualizing the descriptions and topographical notes of the sources is also offered by a few extant buildings which follow the model of

¹²⁷ On the first church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople see G. Downey, "The Builder," with sources and bibliography, E. B. Smith, *The Dome*, p. 32 ff., and J. Vogt, "Der Erbauer."

¹²⁸ The earlier bibliography on the Apostoleion of Justinian is found in A. Heisenberg, *Grabeskirche und Apostelkirche*, II (1908), *passim*, esp. p. 118 ff.; see further, K. Wulzinger, "Die Apostelkirche," p. 7 ff.; S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, p. 53 ff., esp. p. 60, note 2; J. Ebersolt, *Constantinople*, p. 31 ff.; A. M. Schneider, *Byzanz, Vorarbeiten*, p. 52 f.; R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, pt. 1, 3, p. 46 ff. For further bibliography see the following notes.

¹²⁹ The belief of several authors (G. Boni, in *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 397; L. Marangoni, "Un infisso," p. 1127; A. Stransky, "Costantino VII Porfirogenito," pp. 416, 418; S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, p. 60 ff.; *idem*, *Mosaici antichi*, p. 10; *idem*, "Di San Marco," p. 196 ff.) that the Apostoleion of Justinian was profoundly altered or, rather, rebuilt on a smaller scale and newly decorated under Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the tenth century, by the architect Theodore Belonas, has been caused by the misreading of a passage contained in Theophanes Continuatus, lib. VI, chap. 27 (*Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*, ed. Bonn, XXIV/3, p. 452). The text speaks (chaps. 26, 27) of Hieria (Iria) and its environs, especially of the Palace and "the church of the Apostles newly built [or rebuilt] nearby" (ὁ τῶν Ἀποστόλων πλησίον νεουργηθεὶς ναός), which is described as being smaller than the old church, but more richly decorated inside. Theodore Belonas (Velonas), the σύνεργος (collaborator, not necessarily the architect) of the emperor (Constantine Porphyrogenitus) in the erection of this church, received the rank of Patricius for his share in the work.

This church, of course, had nothing to do with the great Apostoleion of Justinian. It was a comparatively small building in Rufinianae near Hieria and Chalcedon, on the Asiatic shore, and is mentioned as an apostles' church in many sources which have been collected by J. Pargoire, "Rufinienes"; *idem*, "Environs"; *idem*, "Hieria"; *idem*, "Autour de Chalcédoine." According to these sources it was first erected at the end of the fourth century by Rufinus, the minister of Theodosius I and Arcadius, and consecrated with relics of Saints Peter and Paul. After having been devastated in the seventh century, it was rebuilt under Patriarch Theophylactus (933-956), that is, in the reign of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The ruins of this church are probably extant (though not yet excavated) at Cadde Bostan, about three miles east of Kadiköy, formerly Chalcedon (E. Mamboury, *Istanbul*, p. 562).

For confirmation of the foregoing I am indebted to Professors Glanville Downey and Paul A. Underwood of Dumbarton Oaks.

¹³⁰ The main sources concerning the Apostoleion are Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, ed. J. Haury (Leipzig, 1913), p. 23 ff.; Constantinus Rhodius: E. Legrand, "Description," p. 32 ff., followed by T. Reinach, "Commentaire archéologique," p. 66 ff.; Nicholas Mesarites: A. Heisenberg, *op. cit.* p. 1 ff.; G. Downey, "Nikolaos Mesarites," p. 853 ff.; Constantinus Porphyrogenitus, *De Cerimoniis*: ed. J. J. Reiske (Bonn, 1829).

the Holy Apostles—though great care has to be taken in using this evidence, so as to avoid circular reasoning.¹³¹ According to these sources, the church of the Holy Apostles, as built by Justinian, was a cruciform building (free-cross), with five cupolas, one above the center, and one above each of the four arms of the cross. The central cupola, the only one that had windows and ribs, was slightly larger than the others. The cupolas were supported by "four-legged" piers and buttressed by barrel vaults. The spaces underneath the outer barrel vaults (the aisles) were screened off from the main cruciform space of the church by a two-storied arcade with "twice four" columns between each pair of pillars, excepting those of the central square. Thus, a continuous two storied gallery ran round the entire circumference of the interior. The lower row of columns supported the floor of the *matronea*, whereas the upper arcade did not support anything: it served only as a screen to separate the secondary spaces from the principal space of the central cross. The walls were pierced by windows in all three stories, the aisles, the galleries, and the upper tympana. Cornices accentuated the horizontal division of the interior into four levels: the ground floor, the galleries, the region of the vaults and pendentives, and the crowning area of the cupolas.

The altar stood in the center, under the middle dome: the church had no apses. Doors in the east wall led to the circular mausoleum of Constantine; other doors opened in the north wall of the transept, while the main entrance was through doors in the west wall, to which a narthex was affixed. Spurs jutting out from the narthex toward north and south contained the staircases to the galleries, and side rooms were arranged alongside the walls of the western crossarm.¹³² The whole structure was preceded by a rectangular atrium, with arcades surrounding an open courtyard, in the center of which stood a fountain.¹³³

It is patent from this description that San Marco, stripped of all its later additions and reduced to its eleventh-century form, shared its most important characteristics with this sixth-century structure (fig. 1). The cruciform shape, the five domes, the central one slightly larger than the others, the barrel vaults, the four-legged piers, the arcades screening off the aisles, are the same. It is possible that other traits of similarity between the two churches could be found if the Constantinopolitan building were better known. It is, however, equally evident that there are quite important differences between Consta-

¹³¹ I am deeply indebted to Professors Underwood, Downey, and to the late Professor Friend, of Dumbarton Oaks, for help and advice in all matters relating to the Apostoleion.

¹³² I believe that there are good reasons for assuming the existence of side-rooms which, together with the narthex itself, enfolded the entire western crossarm of the church, as is the case in San Marco today. See especially the passage in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De Cerimoniis* (I, p. 532, 16) which says that the emperor enters the narthex by the main (west) door, turns to the left, and then goes to the east of the narthex. This argues strongly for the existence of a northern side-room and, by implication, of a southern one also, as in the church of St. John Evangelist at Ephesus (see *infra*). The side-rooms adjoining the western narthex may have been partitioned into single chambers, as in Ephesus.

¹³³ Hypothetical reconstructions of the Apostoleion by H. Hübsch (*Die altchristlichen Kirchen*, pl. XXXII). S. Reinach (*op. cit.*, p. 99); O. Wulff ("Die sieben Wunder," p. 310ff.); C. Gurlitt (*Die Baukunst Konstantinopels*, I, pl. XL, 8p); A. Heisenberg (*op. cit.*, II, p. 113); G. Sotiriou (*Ἀνασκαφαί*, fig. 75 on p. 210); K. Wulzinger (*op. cit.*, figs. 13, 14); S. Bettini (*op. cit.*, pl. VIII) show discrepancies mainly regarding the narthex, the situation of the Heroon of Constantine, the length of the western crossarm, and the distribution of columns.

rini's San Marco and the church of the Holy Apostles as it can be reconstructed from the texts. The most outstanding difference concerns the eastern part of the two churches. While the eastern crossarm of the Holy Apostles was shaped exactly like the domed bays of the transept, with a straight wall to the east screened off by galleries, this part is treated in San Marco like the eastern termination of a basilical building, with a main apse and two side chapels, the galleries of which are supported by massive arches and not by arcaded colonnades. Thus, the church of the Apostles was a truly centralized building with identical crossarms radiating from the center, whereas San Marco was definitely oriented, the central square being not the center of spatial radiation but only an accentuated *étape* in the west-east movement that leads from the main entrance to the apse. This is, of course, connected with the different location of the main altar in the two churches. In the Holy Apostles it stood in the central square, while in San Marco it is in the presbytery. Furthermore, in the latter church the level of the presbytery is raised in order to make room for the crypt. It is in keeping with the semibasilical character of San Marco, that its eastern domed bay is slightly lower, and that the transept bays are considerably lower, than the central and west bays. In addition, the transepts are narrower than the bays of the west-east axis which thus becomes the main axis or nave. The reduction of the transept bays in width and height is brought about by the insertion of arches on twin columns which are placed against the pillars, and by the projection of the colonnades that support the galleries of the transepts. These colonnades have only two columns each as against three in the western crossarm. Consequently, the cupolas of the transept are smaller than those of the main axis. An even more effective "toning down" of the transepts is achieved by the fact that their north and south galleries are not borne by arcades but by solid walls which shorten the extension of free transverse space. Thus, structurally as well as optically, San Marco is not a true equilateral cross, but rather a domed basilica with lateral appendages. Instead of the two-axial symmetry of the Holy Apostles there is only one axis of symmetry: from the solid west wall, which has no colonnades, to the apse.

One of the main differences in the optical effect of the two interiors must have been due to the different treatment of the colonnades. In the Apostoleion they were continuous and two-storied. As the dimensions of the structural shell, and especially of the central square, were probably about equal in both churches, and as there were four columns to each of the outer sides of each bay in the Apostoleion as against three (and, in the transepts, two) in San Marco, the arcades of the former must have been lower and narrower and the columns smaller than those of the latter. There were ninety-six columns in the two-storied colonnades of the Holy Apostles, against fourteen in the single-storied arcades of San Marco. Consequently, the colonnades which must have been the dominant motif of the interior of the Constantinopolitan church—they were treated as such by Mesarites and Constantine of Rhodes¹³⁴—and which gave

¹³⁴ A. Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 128f. On the columns as dominant features of the church, see also Constantine of Rhodes, verse 703ff., in E. Legrand, *op. cit.*, p. 57f.

it a late antique flavor, played a much less important part in San Marco. Nobody could have described the Venetian church as consisting of "five colonnaded halls," as Mesarites characterized the Apostoleion.¹³⁵ Nor had the number of columns in San Marco, either in each bay or all together, any symbolic relation to the twelve apostles, as was the case in the Apostoleion, where each bay was bordered on the ground level by twelve columns, a symbolism emphasized by Constantine of Rhodes.¹³⁶ The fourteen columns of San Marco are, formally or symbolically, no more than the necessary supports of the galleries. There are, however, additional columns in San Marco, namely those that substitute for the "feet" of the "four-legged" piers that are joined to the walls.

Another difference between the two churches concerns the open court of the "Louter" of the Apostoleion which did not exist in Venice, unless the Piazza itself is taken as a substitute for a courtyard.¹³⁷

The question is whether in view of all these differences, San Marco can still be regarded as a "copy" of the Apostles' church. The answer to this question must certainly be in the affirmative, and most authors have, indeed, been of this opinion.¹³⁸ Mediaeval "copying" did not aim at an exact duplication of the prototype. As Krautheimer points out, the "inexactness in reproducing the particular shape of a definite architectural form, in plan as well as in elevation, seems to be one of the outstanding elements in the relation of copy and original in mediaeval architecture."¹³⁹ It was sufficient for a copy to retain the general layout, or only certain peculiarities of measurements and numbers. This becomes especially clear if the numerous "copies" of the church of the Holy Sepulchre are compared with each other and with their model. As regards the degree of faithfulness in "copying," San Marco's relationship to the Apostoleion is closer by far than that of any copy of the Holy Sepulchre to its prototype. We may even go further and state that of all the imitations of the Apostoleion known to us, San Marco is, in spite of its unique traits, the most faithful, with the possible exception of the church of St. John the Evangelist in Ephesus, a building roughly contemporary with the Apostoleion.¹⁴⁰ The Ephesian church, the second "martyrium" of the Evangelist, has been called by Procopius, in his official account of Justinian's building activity, "most like and in all things similar to the sanctuary which the Emperor (Justinian) erected to all the Apostles in the capital,"¹⁴¹ and was thus an avowed copy of the Aposto-

¹³⁵ A. Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 27; G. Downey, "Nikolaos Mesarites," p. 868.

¹³⁶ Verse 7/8f.; E. Legrand, *op. cit.*, p. 57. Mesarites (A. Heisenberg, *op. cit.*, p. 79) takes the twelve "stoai" (halls or arcades) as symbolizing the Apostles.

¹³⁷ A deep well was found in the Piazza. It might be considered as the "Louter," corresponding to that of the atrium of the Holy Apostles. Cf. G. Boni, "Scavi in Piazza," p. 257f.

¹³⁸ On the various opinions about the relationship between the Apostoleion and San Marco, see: C. Briccarelli, "San Marco"; L. Marangoni, *op. cit.*, p. 14ff.; S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, p. 53ff.; W. Zalziesky, *Die Sophienkirche*, p. 155ff.; R. K. Donin, "Byzantinische Einflüsse"; C. Cecchelli, "Sguardo generale," p. 57ff., etc., with bibliographies.

¹³⁹ R. Krautheimer, "Introduction," p. 7.

¹⁴⁰ G. Sotiriou, 'Ανασκαφαί, p. 89ff.; K. Wulzinger, *op. cit.*; *Forschungen in Ephesus*, IV/3, with bibliography; P. Lemerle, "A propos d'une basilique"; H. Hörmann, "Die Johanneskirche," p. 77ff.

¹⁴¹ This text (Procopius, *De Aedificiis*, p. 310) and other sources relating to St. John of Ephesus are reprinted in G. Sotiriou, *op. cit.*, p. 125ff.

leion, with which it has most of its main features in common: the cruciform ground plan, the two-storied arcade going round the entire interior (with the exception of the west and east ends), the narthex, and even some peculiarities, like the slightly greater diameter of the central cupola. On the other hand, there are differences which appear to be greater than those which separate San Marco from the Apostoleion. The Ephesian church has—and this is its most distinguishing feature—six cupolas, the sixth domed bay being added at the west end, thus making the ground plan a latin cross. The piers which support the cupolas are not quadripartite but consist of solid blocks of masonry, with the exception of the western piers of the central square, which are pierced by arches. The upper stories of the galleries were screened off from the main bays not only by arcades as in the Apostoleion, but also by tympana which rose to the height of the vaults. Some of the features which constitute departures from the model of the Apostoleion are shared by the Ephesian church and San Marco alike: especially the apse and the reduction in the number of the columns which support the galleries.

Everything considered, it is a moot question whether St. John or San Marco was closer to the Apostoleion. The scheme was flexible enough to admit of numerous variations without losing its distinctive character. How far these variations and reductions could go can be seen in the church of Our Lady of the Hundred Gates, the Hekatontapyliani (or, more correctly, the Katapoliani) in Paros, which, while preserving the general cruciform layout with surrounding galleries, has retained only one of its prototype's five domes.¹⁴² In another church of the type of the Apostoleion, Saint-Front at Périgueux, all five domes of the model were retained, while the galleries and colonnades were suppressed; only their optical effect was preserved in the blind arcading of the main walls. It is as though the architect of this building, which received its present shape after the fire of 1120,¹⁴³ had taken from his model only the outer shell or the spatial type, and left out everything that he regarded as inessential trappings of the five-domed interior with its quadripartite piers. The question is, however, whether this architect of the twelfth century was inspired directly by the Apostoleion or, rather, by San Marco. That the latter was the case is suggested not only by the fact that Venice was, after all, much nearer and that there were flourishing Venetian colonies in the south of France,¹⁴⁴ but also by the undeniable and specific similarity of the two churches, which has been pointed out

¹⁴² H. H. Jewell and F. W. Hasluck, *The Church*, with bibliography. The western arm of the church may have been covered with a second cupola; the other crossarms had certainly no domes—the eastern arm even retains its original barrel vault (*op. cit.*, p. 51). On the connection of the Panagia Katapoliani with the Apostoleion, see G. Sotiriou, *op. cit.*, p. 223 f.; A. K. Orlandos, 'Ἡ σταυρική βασιλική. On Cyprus, G. Sotiriou, "Les églises."

¹⁴³ J. Roux, *La basilique de Saint-Front*, dates the five-domed part of the building to the eleventh century. Founded about 1013, consecrated in 1047, and completed before 1077, the structure, according to Roux, survived the fire of 1120 and was restored only in the twelfth century. F. de Verneilh was of the same opinion: *L'architecture*, p. 115 ff., and *idem*, "Des influences," but he has been severely criticized by a number of scholars. The controversy was summed up and decided in favor of a date after the fire of 1120 and before 1173 by R. de Lasteyrie, *Architecture religieuse* (2nd ed.), p. 465 ff.; R. K. Donin, "Die Kirchen."

¹⁴⁴ See F. de Verneilh. *L'architecture*, p. 129 ff.; J. Ebersolt, *Orient et Occident*, *passim*.

by Verneilh, Bréhier, and Donin.¹⁴⁵ This similarity concerns not only the ground plan and its almost identical dimensions, but also the architectural articulations such as the twin columns. In particular, the blind arcading of the interior walls of Saint-Front, with three intercolumniations in the transepts and four in the nave, is a projection onto the walls of the gallery arcades of San Marco. The close formal relationship between the two churches is the more remarkable for the differences in building material and technique: Saint-Front is built of stone as against the brick and terracotta technique of San Marco.

However, whether Saint-Front in Périgueux be a copy of San Marco or directly of the Apostoleion, there must have been specific reasons for the builders of Saint-Front to erect a cruciform, five-domed church that basically reproduced the type of the Apostles' church. The existence of Venetian colonies in southern France, or the pilgrimages to the Holy Land by way of Venice or Constantinople cannot be held to account satisfactorily for this building which subsequently exerted so widespread and deep an influence on French Romanesque architecture.¹⁴⁶ Professor Grabar has found the specific reason for the use of the Apostoleion's ground plan in Périgueux: the cruciform building was joined to the older church as a "chevet-martyrium," to house the relics of St. Front who, from the ninth century on, was venerated as the founder of Christianity in the Périgord and held equal to the apostles. Thus, Saint-Front was, in its way, an "apostle's church."¹⁴⁷

The same, as we have seen, was the case with San Marco from its first foundation as a cruciform church in the ninth century. The idea that this church was an Apostoleion was not forgotten in subsequent years. We have conclusive proof of its survival in a sermon preached by Petrus Damiani in the church of San Marco itself, shortly before or during its rebuilding by Contarini. In this sermon the bishop praised Venice as the treasure house of the supreme King and for having become, by harboring the relics of St. Mark, *quodammodo sedes apostolica*. Nothing could have pleased the Venetians better. By using these words, Peter catered to their ambition to have their church recognized as a *sedes apostolica*, even if this was qualified by the shrewd prelate with the particle *quodammodo*.¹⁴⁸ For the central church of the *sedes apostolica* no other shape was thinkable than that of the Apostoleion, the church of the apostles *par excellence*. It was, therefore, not only understandable, but inevitable that the Venetians should have

¹⁴⁵ F. de Verneilh, *op. cit.*, p. 13 ff.; L. Bréhier, "Les églises d'Aquitaine," p. 241 ff.; R. K. Donin, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

¹⁴⁶ Especially in Angoulême. Cf. G. and A. Guérin-Boutaud, *Les églises romanes*; the ground plans of domed cruciform churches on p. 194 ff.

¹⁴⁷ A. Grabar, "Saint-Front," p. 501 ff., esp. p. 502, note 2.

¹⁴⁸ The passage, *Felix quidem Alexandria, quam hic Christi bellator [St. Mark] invictus triumphalis martyrii sui sanguine purpuravit, sed praecipue tu felix es et nimium beata Venetia quam ad hoc, ut preciosum corporis tui thesaurum tibi commendaret, elegit... Gaude igitur et exsultans in domino plaude, Venetia, quia per illud pretiosi thesauri talentum quod in te constat esse reconditum, facta es superni regis aerarum, et dum in tuo gremio virum apostolicae gratiae suscepisti et ipsa quodammodo sedes apostolica fieri meruisti...* (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CXLIV [1867], col. 584 f.), stands at the end of the last of three sermons on St. Mark, all of which, as the direct *allocutio* shows, were preached in Venice, and most probably in San Marco, in the third quarter of the eleventh century. The three sermons are genuine; they are not among those which must be ascribed to Nicholas of Clairvaux. On Peter Damiani (1006/7-1072), see M. Manitius, *Geschichte*, III, p. 68 ff., with bibliography.

remodeled their church once more after the Apostoleion when they rebuilt it in the eleventh century. This time they were able to copy the prototype more closely than had been possible in the ninth century, when the first San Marco was built. At that early stage of its development Venice was hardly in a position to equal the Apostoleion; its patrons and architects had to be content with a "symbolic" copy which incorporated only the most essential features of its model, probably omitting the cupolas and most of the other details. In the second half of the eleventh century, however, the financial, technical, and political means at the disposal of Venice permitted a closer approximation, almost a duplication of the much admired and revered prototype. The political rapprochement between Venice and Byzantium provided both the incentive and the opportunity for calling on a Byzantine architect as "proto" of the rebuilding.

Nor was Venice "out of fashion" in doing so. San Marco was not the only building in eleventh-century Italy that imitated a Byzantine prototype. Before 1026, Bishop Theodaldus of Arezzo sent his architect, Maginardus, to Ravenna in order to study and measure S. Vitale as a model for the new cathedral of Arezzo;¹⁴⁹ and at the very time of the rebuilding of San Marco, the cathedral of Pisa was built after an eastern model by a Tuscan(?) architect who must have travelled extensively in Byzantine lands.¹⁵⁰ These are only two of many examples of the great popularity of eastern models in the early Romanesque architecture of Italy,¹⁵¹ but there is, among many such Byzantine-inspired buildings, none that comes so near its prototype, none that has the same "authentic ring," as San Marco.

In spite of this, San Marco was not a slavish reproduction of the Apostoleion. Nor were the discrepancies which have been pointed out above fortuitous; they all have their *raison d'être*. Some irregularities were caused by the necessity of adhering as closely as possible to the foundation walls of the preceding structures. The existing south wall of San Teodoro, for instance, prohibited the extension of the arcades to the north wall of the transept, and similar reasons, together with the exigencies of symmetry, may have existed for the south wall. It must not be forgotten that the available space was limited, even if old San Teodoro was in large part pulled down or incorporated into the great church.

More important still were reasons of cult. The new church had to have a crypt, an apse, and side chapels. In a "martyrium" pure and simple, such as the Apostoleion, it was quite in order for the altar to stand in the center of the building which, therefore, could, and in fact had to, be arranged in two-axial symmetry around this center; the more so, as the "mausoleum" was an almost independent structure attached to the east end of church. For a dynastic church and a state sanctuary, such as San Marco, this may have been appropriate and possible in the ninth century, but it was certainly impossible in the second

¹⁴⁹ The document of 1026 in U. Pasqui, *Documenti*, I, p. 176. This church (S. Donato) was consecrated in 1033 and destroyed in 1554; its ground plan, preserved in a sixteenth-century drawing, showed only the most general resemblance to S. Vitale. M. Salmi, *L'architettura romanica*, p. 23, fig. 42.

¹⁵⁰ S. Guyer, "Der Dom von Pisa," p. 352 ff.; M. Salmi, "La genesi," p. 149 ff.; H. Thümmler, "Die Baukunst," p. 183 ff.

¹⁵¹ For other examples of this general trend, see: G. de Angelis d'Ossat, *Le influenze bizantine*.

half of the eleventh, when more than one altar was required and the main altar had to be above the principal relics in the "chevet,"—the *caput ecclesiae*—contrary to the usage of Byzantium where the location of the altar was independent from that of the relics.¹⁵² This was the most important single factor which prevented the architects of San Marco from following their prototype in all its features. By the shifting of the main altar eastward, to a presbytery, the strictly centralized plan was basically altered and a longitudinal development of the entire interior was suggested. It will be seen that this was also one of the determining factors in the arrangement of the mosaic decoration.

So far, the alterations and adaptations of the model, brought about as they were by previous structures, reasons of space, and necessities of cult, could have been made by a Greek architect. No architect, even had he been Anthemius or Isidorus the Younger, the architects of the Apostoleion itself, could have escaped these necessities. There are other features in San Marco which, though they differ from those of its prototype, still bear the stamp of Greek architecture, but not of the sixth century. The arcaded pillars of the façade, for instance, have parallels in mid-Byzantine Constantinopolitan churches (Pantocrator, Kilisse Camii, Myrelaion). Even some of the decorative motifs, for example, the engaged half-columns and recessed brick arches, are derived from middle Byzantine practice (e.g. the Panagia Chalkeon in Salonica, of the eleventh century). The most important middle Byzantine tendency, however, to which the architect of San Marco was indebted, is that towards the spatial unity of the interior. By doing away with the upper colonnade (i.e. the columnar screen of the galleries) of the Apostoleion, he achieved a much more intimate connection between the primary space of the domed bays and the secondary spatial units of the aisles. In doing so, he followed the trend towards spatial unification that becomes apparent in the evolution of Byzantine eleventh-century architecture, culminating in the one-room churches of the type of the Nea Moni.¹⁵³ The Nea Moni shows also the twin columns of San Marco, arranged in two tiers.

In addition to these Greek features and tendencies, however, which are in part Justinianic and in part middle Byzantine, the eleventh-century architecture of San Marco also incorporated motifs and trends which are definitely occidental. The crypt, first of all, is Western, even unmistakably Italian. Its ground plan, including the articulation of the niches in the side apses, follows that of the presbytery above, but its central body is extended further westward than the side-rooms, so that the general shape becomes that of a Greek cross (fig. 20). Crypts of this kind can rarely be found in Byzantium, but the same ground plan was used in Italy, e.g. in the crypt of the church of Abbazia San Salvatore (Monte Amiata), which is dated 1036, and thus predates San Marco by twenty-five to thirty years, and in the twelfth-century crypts of the Cathe-

¹⁵² See A. Grabar, *Martyrium*, I, esp. chap. 5, "Le culte des reliques et l'architecture en Orient," p. 400 ff. On the independent location of altar and relics in Byzantium, *ibid.*, I, p. 353.

¹⁵³ Most of the examples adduced here are illustrated in J. Ebersolt, *Monuments d'architecture*, and in A. van Millingen, *Byzantine Churches*.

drals of Piacenza and Parma.¹⁵⁴ The choice of this form of crypt may have been suggested in San Marco by reasons of cult symbolism, but it remains, nevertheless, a typically Italian form. No less Italian is a feature which the crypt shares with the apses and the exterior walls of the church, namely, the multiple niches of square or semicircular shape, which can be traced back in Italy to pagan Roman architecture and are found especially in the ground plans of martyria.¹⁵⁵ In the Veneto, this manner of treating exterior and interior walls seems to have been in use from late Roman and early Christian times right down to the twelfth century; from the triconchos and the baptistery of Concordia to St. Sophia in Padua and the great cathedrals of Murano and Jesolo.¹⁵⁶

The presbyteries of the last-named church, the "baptistery" of San Pietro di Castello, and the church of San Giacomo di Rialto (rebuilt in the second half of the twelfth century) show the same form as that of San Marco. It is possible that in this San Marco followed an earlier Venetian tradition.

Another decidedly western trait to be found in San Marco is the slight reduction of the space radiating from the center, both in height and in width. This reduction is brought about by the insertion of multiple arches, especially in the main axis of the church. The main apse is presented to the beholder within a series of multiple arched frames, an artifice by which the main axis is made to appear longer. This contributes substantially to the "basilical" character of the church. [The same artifice was used in the early eleventh-century church of Abbazia San Salvatore, a cruciform building with a prolonged single nave.¹⁵⁷

The brick technique of San Marco is also Western (fig. 21). It is totally different from the "monolithe artificiel" of Byzantine architecture, where the interstices of mortar or cement are almost as wide as the flat bricks. In San Marco, as in other Italian eleventh-century buildings, the bricks are much thicker and are joined together by very thin layers of mortar. The Italian character of the decorative forms of San Marco has never been doubted since it was pointed out by Cattaneo. The most important difference between the Italian and the Byzantine system is the absence in the former of a graduated scale. Large arches are contrasted with miniature "archetti" without transition. These "archetti" are used chiefly on the façades, as arcuated friezes or corbel tables, forms which have their closest parallels in the early Romanesque architecture of the Emilia and the Romagna.

The most interesting, because most easily datable, decorative details of the eleventh-century façades of San Marco are friezes of scrolls, interlaces, and animals, carved or modelled in the "two-plane" early Romanesque technique (fig. 31). Some characteristic examples of these reliefs, found in the walls of the

¹⁵⁴ H. Thümmler, *op. cit.*, p. 200f.

¹⁵⁵ See the ground plans in A. Grabar, *op. cit.*, figs. 28f., 47, 68-72, and S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

¹⁵⁶ On Concordia see P. L. Zovatto, "Antichi monumenti"; *idem*, "Battistero," p. 171f. On St. Sophia in Padua: S. Bettini, "Padova," p. 256ff.; H. Thümmler, *op. cit.*, p. 182, fig. 177; on Murano and Jesolo: H. Rathgens, *San Donato*. Of the great eleventh-century church of Jesolo hardly anything is left today.

¹⁵⁷ On this phenomenon in Sicilian architecture, see O. Demus, *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily*, p. 28 and *passim*. Abbazia San Salvatore: H. Thümmler, *op. cit.*, p. 195, fig. 193.

Cappella Zeno, are preserved in the Museo Civico Correr and in the Maggazine of San Marco, behind the main apse.¹⁵⁸ As has already been observed by Cattaneo, this terracotta decor is identical, to the minutest detail, with the decor to be found still *in situ* in Pomposa, on the façade of the atrium and on the campanile, where it is dated by an inscription of 1063 and "signed" by a master Mazulo who, judging by the form of his name, seems to have been a native of the Romagna.¹⁵⁹ On the strength of this it would not be too fantastic to suppose that one of Mazulo's collaborators was called to Venice after the completion of the decor of Pomposa, to execute at least a part of the architectural decoration of San Marco.

To sum up: the building of the eleventh century followed, in its main outline, and used part of the substructures of the first shrine of the Evangelist. Like the church of the ninth century, it was a "copy" of the Apostoleion, but reproduced it more closely than did its predecessors. The chief architect of the Contarini church, who must have been a Greek from Constantinople, incorporated, however, several contemporary elements into his copy of the Holy Apostles, elements and tendencies which he derived from middle Byzantine architecture. Considerations of space, extant foundations, and necessities of cult forced him to deviate from his model in important particulars. His western (Italian) collaborators or successors and the western workmen gave to the execution of the building an Italian cast in technique and detail. The great church of the eleventh century was widely imitated. A good many churches in and near Venice itself (Murano, etc.) and several buildings both in and outside Italy followed San Marco either in their spatial disposition or in important details. The influence of San Marco continued throughout the Gothic (e.g. Santo in Padua) and the Renaissance periods (e.g. San Salvatore and other Venetian churches of its type) and was still operative in the neo-classic art of the early nineteenth century. Some characteristic details of San Marco have gained such great importance and have become so widespread in the later development of ecclesiastical architecture that their real origin has become obscured.¹⁶⁰

4. *Façades.* The façades of the church (figs. 2-6) received their characteristic "plastic" shape from the second quarter of the thirteenth century on. The outstanding feature of the architectural decoration of these façades is the lavish use of columns. They all but smother the architectural body with their

¹⁵⁸ L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," fig. 6, and G. Ferrari, *La terracotta*, p. 68, pl. LXI.

¹⁵⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 174 ff. The identity was also acknowledged by C. Ricci in G. Ferrari, *op. cit.*, p. X, and by M. Salmi, *L'abbazia*, p. 41 ff., figs. 64, 199, pl. VI; C. Errard and A. Gayet, *L'art byzantin*, III/2, *Ravenne et Pomposa*, pls. III, VII. The date 1063 is contained in an inscription of Magister Deusdedit on the Campanile (Salmi, *op. cit.*, p. 250, fig. 413). The inscription containing the name of Mazulo (Salmi, *ibid.*, p. 250, fig. 412) is set into the façade of the atrium and is still *in situ*. It is not itself dated, and Salmi connects it with the consecration of 1026; since, however, the style of the terracotta ornaments of the atrium is identical with that of the decor of the campanile, dated 1063, the latter date seems preferable. This date is also accepted by J. Puig i Cadafalch, "More Decorative Forms," p. 77.

¹⁶⁰ R. K. Donin, *op. cit.* p. 3 f., with bibliography; *idem*, *Vincenzo Scamozzi*, p. 36 ff.; *idem*, "Venezianisches"; R. Rieger, "Der Santo." On the Venetian churches which form the so-called "School of San Marco," see H. Rathgens, *op. cit.*, p. 43 ff.

massed bundles. Their role in articulating the architecture of the thirteenth century is comparable to that played by long narrow niches in buildings of the eleventh.

It is very likely that the indiscriminate use of columns was occasioned by the Fourth Crusade; in any case, it was made possible by the arrival of innumerable columns that were shipped to Venice after 1204, together with other items of architectural decoration, transennae, figured reliefs, etc.

Some of the columns brought from Constantinople were cut up and used as material for friezes and mouldings (e.g. those of the central porch),¹⁶¹ but most of them were employed in their original form, in an endeavor to transform the sober brick façades into shining colonnades of marble, porphyry, and verd antique. The colonnaded façades of San Marco are the Venetian counterpart of the protorenaissance façades of the churches of Pisa and Lucca. In fact, they are as much the products of a protorenaissance movement as their Tuscan parallels. It is an indication of the strength of this current, that the ogival arch which had penetrated into Venetian architecture towards the end of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century, was, in the middle of the Ducento, superseded again by the semicircular arch. A most interesting example of this is the Porta dei Fiori in the easternmost bay of the north wing of the atrium. During the campaign of the early thirteenth century, this entrance porch had been built with sharply pointed arches of a fully developed Gothic type; now, about the middle of the thirteenth century, or a little later, these Gothic arches were hidden behind an incrustation in which only semicircular arches were used, stilted whenever necessary in order to reach the required height.

Other "mediaevalisms" were eliminated at the same time: the small niches of the central porch of the façade were altered and unified into one great niche; the oblique corners of the west façade were cut back to form rectangular recesses in which were placed free-standing columns supporting arches.¹⁶² By this means the western façade was elongated so as to stress the horizontal extension of the colonnade and to leave its ends open, thereby suggesting its continuation around the entire Piazza. Indeed, the church became at that time a part of the Piazza and, conversely, the Piazza took on the semblance of a huge atrium, a "quadriportico," leading up to the church and forming an indivisible unit with it. This, too, conforms with the idea of a revival of Early Christian schemes.¹⁶³

Renascence ideas seem, indeed, to have generally dominated Venetian architecture in the thirteenth century. As far as we know the secular buildings of this period, they were thoroughly imbued with a protorenaissance spirit.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ L. Marangoni, "L'architetto," fig. 11.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, figs. 19-23.

¹⁶³ This is very well brought out in S. Bettini's book, *L'architettura*, p. 233 ff. The enlargement of the Piazza towards the west began in 1156. In the course of this work the church of S. Geminiano was destroyed and rebuilt further west (between 1156 and 1173). The work was concluded with the paving of the Piazza in 1264/67: G. J. Fontana, *La piazza*.

¹⁶⁴ On Venetian palaces in general, see: L. Cicognara, A. Diedo, G. Selva, *Le fabbriche*; P. Selvatico, *Sulla architettura*; O. Mothes, *Geschichte*, p. 147 ff. (with dates which are too early); G. J. Fontana, *Cento palazzi*; L. de Beylié, *L'habitation byzantine*, I, p. 154 ff. (with dates in the eleventh and twelfth

Though most of the great houses of the thirteenth century were destroyed—e.g. the Cà Grande dei Barozzi or the Casa Giustiniani, both in the San Moisé quarter¹⁶⁵—or were altered beyond recognition—like the Fondaco dei Turchi¹⁶⁶—there are sufficient data and records still extant to justify the statement that the distinguishing feature of these palaces was a colonnaded, two-storied portico dissolving, as it were, almost the entire front of the building. Of course, an architecture like this could develop only in a period in which Venice held the unchallenged dominion of the Adriatic and in which peace and order reigned in the city itself. In this city the palace-fortresses of other Ducento towns would have been out of place. That the “portico-style” of Venetian thirteenth-century architecture could develop in so rich a form, was made possible by the plunder of the eastern Mediterranean and by the rise of a new “renaissance” taste. It has been said above that political thought in thirteenth-century Venice was governed by the idea of the “Renovatio Imperii Christiani,” a concept with which the Venetians attempted to justify the acquisition of the new colonial empire of the Levant; the return to Early Christian forms in Venetian art was the expression of this idea. It will be seen that all the arts—painting, sculpture, and architecture—were, for some time at least, under the spell of this idea, which must have taken root easily in a cultural atmosphere that was at all times inclined towards archaism.

The façades of San Marco and of secular buildings of thirteenth-century Venice can only be explained by this protorenaissance movement. Professor Swoboda has pointed out that the type of portico-façade, as represented by the original state of the Fondaco dei Turchi, has nothing to do with contemporary Byzantine architecture, as was believed by others, and very little with contemporary architecture in general, excepting a general similarity to the Tuscan protorenaissance. He has shown that the façade of the Fondaco is rather “a mediaeval fossilization of the late Roman style” of the fifth and sixth centuries.¹⁶⁷ His assumption, however, that this was a genuine *survival* based on a continuity of tradition in the lagoons, can hardly be proved;¹⁶⁸ everything points to its having been a *revival*, parallel to, and of a piece with, the revival of Early Christian art in sculpture and painting. As in these other arts, the

instead of the thirteenth century); G. Fiocco, “La casa Veneziana,” p. 38 ff. G. Mariacher, “Capitelli,” p. 43 ff.; S. Bettini, *Venezia*, pls. 32 ff. The most important of the thirteenth-century palaces still standing are the Palazzi da Mosto (formerly Falier), Loredan, Farsetti (formerly Dandolo), Businello, and the Fondaco dei Turchi (formerly Pesaro).

¹⁶⁵ Of the Cà Grande dei Barozzi near San Moisé a record is preserved in Jacopo de Barbari's engraved plan of 1500, reproduced in G. Lorenzetti, “Un prototipo,” p. 27, fig. 1. The Casa dei Giustiniani, also at S. Moisé, is pictured in Giovanni Pivdor's lithograph of 1860 (*ibid.*, p. 39, fig. 5). The architectural decor of the latter is very close to that of San Marco.

¹⁶⁶ A. Sagredo and F. Berchet, *Il fondaco*; P. Paoletti, *L'architettura e la scultura*, p. 36 ff.; K. M. Swoboda, *Römische und Romanische Paläste*, 2nd ed., p. 19 ff., with bibliography. This building, which suffered most disastrous restorations in 1858 and in the years following, was originally the palace of the Pesaro family; from 1381 to 1602 it was in the possession of the Este; not until 1621 did it become the “Fondaco dei Turchi.” The best analysis of its architecture is that by K. M. Swoboda, *loc. cit.*

¹⁶⁷ K. M. Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 195. Professor Swoboda dates the Fondaco in the twelfth century.

¹⁶⁸ One of the missing links between Early Christian palaces and the Fondaco postulated by Swoboda, *op. cit.*, might be seen in the Palazzo della Ragione of Pomposa which is dated by M. Salmi, *L'abbazia*, p. 78 ff., figs. 129, 134, in the eleventh century. This date is, however, unlikely; it is much more probable that the building belongs to the thirteenth century.

architectural ideas of the protorenaissance profoundly influenced subsequent development. The solution found at that time set the pattern for most of the façades of later Venetian palaces, from the Ducal Palace and the Cà d'Oro to the great houses of the seventeenth century. In all of them, the two-storied colonnade was the essential theme and even great foreign architects, like Sansovino and Palladio, adapted their conceptions to the dominant spirit of Venetian architecture.

The style of incrustation and architectural decoration that grew out of this protorenaissance might be called a "plastic" style, but this would be true only in a limited sense, namely with regard to its use of plastically protruding forms, such as friezes, columns, and arches. The effect which was produced by these devices is not at all a plastic or sculptural one. The single plastic forms and motifs are drowned, as it were, in their multiplication and accumulation. What results is an optical effect. There is an interplay of light and shade and the façades take on the character of a multicolored relief with light shafts, dark intercolumniations, and gaping niches. Indeed, this style of architecture and decoration is as typically Venetian as those which preceded and followed it. Like all Venetian styles, it is an optical, a picturesque, a chiaroscuro style.

The stronger accents which the lower part of the façades of San Marco received in the thirteenth century from the incrustation, from the addition of columns, and from structural changes like the extension of the pillars that frame the porches, were counterbalanced by strong new accents in the upper part. The central arches were heightened and, above all, it was at this time that the cupolas received their high, bell-shaped superstructures, an alteration which profoundly changed the original aspect of the exterior.¹⁶⁹ From the point of view of balanced form, the heightening of the cupolas was necessary as soon as the lower stories of the façade received more weight from their new decoration. The widening of the Piazza too called for stronger accents.

The new aspect of the church with its colonnaded façade and its high cupolas is depicted in the only surviving old mosaic of the façade itself, in the lunette of the left side door, the Porta Sant' Alipio (fig. 10). Not only does this provide valuable information as to how the Venetians of the thirteenth century "saw" their San Marco—it also provides a *terminus ante* for the completion of the main part of the work. The mosaic is not securely dated but its style points to the third quarter of the thirteenth century. Furthermore, in Martino da Canale's *Chronique des Veniciens*, begun in 1267, and continued to include the events of 1275, the mosaic is mentioned as part of a series adorning the west façade and depicting the transfer of the Patron Saint's relics from Alexandria to Venice. The mosaic must have existed in 1267 since it is mentioned in the earliest part of the work; on the other hand, the work on the façade seems to have been actually in progress at the time of Martino's writing. He says expressly that the Venetians "continue to embellish their church from day to day." Thus the

¹⁶⁹ At the same time the windows of the cupolas were framed with ogee arches in red marble. However, some of these thirteenth-century frames were replaced by rounded arches in the fifteenth century.

Chronique des Veniciens provides a *terminus ad quem*, the third quarter of the thirteenth century, for the transformation of the exterior of San Marco.¹⁷⁰

Most of this work was done in the protorenaissance style described above. It would be, however, an oversimplification if in an account of the development of Venetian art about and after the middle of the thirteenth century only this current were stressed. At the same time there existed a perceptible undercurrent of Saracenic taste, an undercurrent which was responsible for the orientaling forms of some of the door lunettes of the façade and of the interior (figs. 88–94, 96). The simplest of these lunettes, those over the lateral doors of the west façade have arches of a barely noticeable ogee shape. The arch of the Porta dei Fiori in the north wing of the atrium (fig. 91) is more strongly accentuated. It is a broken ogee arch; such also is the door between the south transept and the Tesoro, with the difference that here the ogee arch is slenderer and more pointed. The most complicated form is to be found in the lunette above the Porta San Giovanni, which leads from the north transept into the north wing of the atrium (fig. 96). Its ogee arch is broken twice, in curves of varying diameters. The ductus of these forms points to Fatimid and, especially to Ayyubid art as its source, and the same is true of the screens of the small windows in the porch of the Porta Sant'Alipio (fig. 88) and of the main apse, with their Saracenic traceries.¹⁷¹ These, the only Saracenic elements to be found in the architecture of San Marco, are, however, few and are, moreover, transformed in a specifically Venetian manner. In this the Venetian attitude was entirely different from that of the Sicilians in the twelfth century. In Sicily, the Islamic element was a

¹⁷⁰ A. Rossi (ed.), "La cronaca"; on the author and his work, see Rossi's introduction, pp. 229–267 and H. Simonsfeld, *Venezianische Studien*, p. 110ff. In his chronicle (p. 286ff., esp. 290) Da Canale describes the theft of the relics of St. Mark in Alexandria by the Venetians, and continues: "... [the ship] conduist li benoit cors de Monseignor Saint Marc en Venice et fu si bien receus come il apert a sa bele Yglise, et a sa bele Place et a la devocion que les Venesiens ont en lui: que maintenant que il fu venus en Venise, mistrent il lor espoir en lui et li donerent la seignorie de Venise, et porterent de lors en avant la beneoite figure dou precios Evangeliste; et ce fu en l'an de l'incarnacion de Notre Seignor Iesu Crist DCCC, le derain ior de jener. Si font li Venisiens chascun an en cel ior bele feste et honoree de Monseignor Saint Marc. Et se aucun vodra savoir la verite tot ensi com ie le vos ai conte, *veigne veoir la bele Yglise de Monseignor Saint Marc en Venise, et regarde tres devant le bele Yglise que est escrit tote ceste estoire tot enci com ie la vos ai contee*; et aura li grant pardon de VII ans, que fist Monseignor l'Apostolle a ciaux qui vont en cele bele Yglise. Ed de lors en avant que li Venisiens orent fait si bele Yglise, si loerent que ele *fust chascun an amende a tos iors mais, et ensi le font*: et est ceste bele Yglise a Monseignor li Dus." The beginning of this passage makes it quite clear that Martino da Canale included in his description the last mosaic which depicts the triumphal reception of the relics in San Marco. This settles Beissel's doubts as to whether the date of 1275 (or, rather, 1267) applies to this mosaic also or merely to the preceding ones, of which we have only the pictorial record in Gentile Bellini's procession panel (fig. 9) (*Die mittelalterlichen Mosaiken*, col. 236). Martino da Canale was a keen observer, and "paintures" had for him a source value as great as "scritures": "que quant l'en voit peinte une estoire ... si nos est avis que nos sommes present. ..." He was, moreover, very proud of San Marco and can be taken at his word when he concludes his account with the statement that the Venetians continued from day to day the work of embellishing their church. This statement he repeats in a later part of the *Chronique* (*loc. cit.*, p. 552): "cele bele Iglise meesme que les Veneciens firent et feront a tos iors mes [—plus belle]." The dating of the mosaic in the first quarter of the thirteenth century by F. Kieslinger, "Unbekanntes," is entirely unfounded.

¹⁷¹ The most recent treatment of this very complex question is to be found in K. M. Swoboda, "Berührungen" (with bibliography). Window screens, resembling those of San Marco, are to be found in S. Gregorio, Bari, as was pointed out to me by Professor A. Grabar. Some of the Saracenic window screens may have been imported from the East, possibly from Syria (Damaskus). See H. G. Franz, "Transennae."

strong, all-pervading current, fostered by royal patronage and disseminated, in part, by Muhammedan craftsmen, both natives of Sicily and immigrants from Fatimid Egypt. In Venice, on the other hand, Venetian artists employed a few isolated forms of Islamic origin and amalgamated them in decorative ensembles of a thoroughly Venetian cast.

The likeliest places in which the Venetians could have found the models for these Islamic features were Syria, where they had had colonies since the early twelfth century, and Egypt. Venice concluded commercial treaties with the latter country in 1207, 1217, 1238, 1244, and 1254,¹⁷² and had a colony under a consul in Alexandria. Since the Venetians were eager for "authentications," it is possible that the "Alexandrian" motifs in San Marco were intended to serve as an "authentic" background for the relics of the Evangelist, which had been brought to Venice from Alexandria. This attitude would at least have been consistent with the ecclesiastical policy of the republic in the thirteenth century. It might even have been a part of the "renovatio" program which led at the same time to a revival of the Early Christian arts of the eastern Mediterranean.

However this may be, it is certain that some of the Saracenic decorative forms which were imported into Venice in the thirteenth century, came to stay and gave a specific color to much of Venetian architecture down to the fifteenth century, especially to seigneurial architecture, where ogee arches and multilobed patterns combined with open-work screens to form complicated tracery designs: thus the Saracenic taste merged with the Gothic.

In the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries the façades of San Marco were enriched with new windows, sculptures, and cornices, and with a new socle the continuous line of which was broken only by the principal doorways of the church, viz. the central porch, the Porta Sant' Alipio, the Porta dei Fiori, and the south entrance; the upper stories blossomed out in canopies, arches, and statues. From 1500 on no real additions were made to the exterior: whatever was added replaced something of earlier date. In the nineteenth century, finally, the cold touch of the restorer's hand destroyed much of the charm of one of the most picturesque monuments of Europe.¹⁷³

¹⁷² See H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, II, pp. 160, 568, 592, with bibliography.

¹⁷³ For the more recent history of the building, see the Appendix by Ing. F. Forlati. The present study does not deal with the campanile of San Marco. On this subject see F. Saccardo, *Il campanile*; G. R. Gattinoni, *Il campanile* (1910 and 1912); P. L. Rambaldi, *Mostra storico-artistica*. For the first bell-tower see F. Saccardo, *Il primo campanile*. For the documents referring to the building campaigns under Domenico Morosini and Vitale II Michael, see *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 8, nos. 75-79, p. 210, no. 817.

BOOK THREE

SCULPTURE

I. INTRODUCTION. THE ROLE OF SCULPTURE IN SAN MARCO

In this section we shall discuss the numerous pieces of sculpture which are set into the walls of San Marco as part of the incrustation, affixed to the façades as plastic decoration, or placed in the interior as sculptural accents. Of course, an extensive study of Venetian sculpture in general cannot be expected in this survey, the aim of which is primarily to enquire into the function and the history of sculptural decoration in San Marco, as regards both iconography and form, and to group the various parts of this decor according to the historic and stylistic currents to which they can be assigned.

Although some authors have made important contributions to our knowledge of Venetian sculpture, there exists to this day no dependable history of this interesting branch of Venetian art. We even lack a comprehensive analytical survey of the sculpture of San Marco.¹ The dates assigned to certain pieces of the plastic decoration of the church differ in some cases by as much as seven centuries; there exists, furthermore, nothing even approaching a consensus of opinion on the question of what is to be regarded as Venetian and what as Byzantine sculpture. This deplorable state of our knowledge is certainly not due to lack of interest on the part of art historians, but to the intrinsic difficulties of the problem and, above all, to the peculiar role assigned by the Venetians to the works of sculpture in the decoration of San Marco. Only a comparatively small part of the sculptural decoration of the church is architectural in the sense of its being indissolubly bound to the architecture and, therefore, datable by it. Most of the sculptural decoration seems to have been set into the walls and façades as additional decor, not as an integral part of an over-all plan. From a superficial examination one can only conclude that these various carvings could have been set into their present

¹ Brief descriptions and surveys are contained in most books and guides on San Marco, the best in *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 245 ff., and G. Lorenzetti, *San Marco*, *passim*. An iconographical description of the façades of San Marco was given by J. Durand, "Iconographie."

The handbook of A. Venturi, *Storia*, vols. II and III; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I; G. Vitzthum and W. F. Volbach, *Die Malerei*; A. Haseloff, *Pre-Romanesque Sculpture*; and R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, deal mainly with the Italo-Venetian part of the sculpture of the church, while the books on Byzantine art (C. Diehl, *Manuel*; A. Colasanti and C. Ricci, *L'art*; O. M. Dalton, *Byzantine Art*; O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und Byzantinische Kunst*; L. Bréhier, *Recherches*; *idem*, *La sculpture*, and S. Bettini, *La scultura*) contain some of the Byzantine or pseudo-Byzantine material found in San Marco.

Of the works dealing specifically with the development of Venetian sculpture in the Middle Ages, the older ones by L. Cicognara, *Storia*; P. Selvatico, *Sulla architettura*; O. Mothes, *Geschichte*, and the chapters (by F. and G. Saccardo respectively) in *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 245 ff., were superseded by H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*. P. de Bouchaud, *La sculpture*, adds little or nothing. For certain aspects of Venetian thirteenth-century sculpture, see E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*. The late thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries are treated by L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," and R. Krautheimer, "Zur venezianischen Trecentoplastik," both with bibliography. On the relationship of Venetian sculpture to Antelami see G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*. On Venetian sculpture seen as part of Italian sculpture in general see G. H. Crichton, *Romanesque Sculpture*. — On the state of preservation of the façades of San Marco, see C. Yriarte, "Les restaurations."

location at almost any time. It is clear that some of them are today not located in the places which they originally occupied in San Marco; in fact, several of these sculptures were made for other purposes long before they were first used in this church. This does not mean that all the "displaced" sculptures of San Marco are spoils imported to Venice from abroad, although a great number of them are. Some may have been made in Venice by Venetian artists, even for San Marco itself, only to be taken from their original context at a later period and used as more or less meaningless decorations in other parts of the church.

Another intrinsic difficulty to be encountered in classifying, interpreting, and dating the large body of Marcian sculpture lies in our scant knowledge of the development of Byzantine and Italo-Byzantine sculpture in general, in the tendency of the Venetians towards archaisms of every kind, and in their aptitude for copying and even for faking. Thus hardly anything can be taken at its face value and many questions must at present remain unsolved.

If the attitude of the Venetians towards sculptural decoration is compared with that of other Italian centers in the period from the latter part of the eleventh century to the middle of the thirteenth century, an essential difference becomes apparent. In Modena, Cremona, Verona, Piacenza, Pavia, Parma, and Ferrara, the birthplaces of resurgent mediaeval plastic art in Italy, sculpture had its definite place in the context of architecture. It appears to be an outgrowth of architectural energies, a crystallization, as it were, of tectonic and functional forces. In these centers sculpture was created for a definite place and for a well-defined function which it could fulfill only in the location for which it was conceived and produced. It belongs primarily to architecture and cannot be separated from it without damaging both architectural and sculptural functionalism. In Venice we find very little of this intimate connection. The building of Contarini had little sculptural decoration; there were some capitals and friezes, parapet slabs around the altars and in the galleries and, perhaps, a few pieces with figures. In the twelfth century many of the protomes of the corbel table were added, but it was only in the beginning of the thirteenth century that architectural sculpture made its appearance in San Marco in increased quantity. Even then, however, the influx of spoils from the eastern Mediterranean and the effect of Byzantine models at first prevented this development from gaining momentum. Thus even in the mid-thirteenth century the functional use of sculptural decoration was restricted to the arches that frame the doorways of the façade. This does not mean, however, that the other parts of the façades or the interior of the church were devoid of sculpture; on the contrary, almost all the walls of the church, with the exception of the upper parts, are studded with carvings (figs. 2, 3, 5-7). The conception of decorating a building with independent pieces of sculpture—almost exclusively reliefs—is foreign to western art; it is a Byzantine conception of plastic decoration.

In the post-iconoclastic art of Byzantium, plastic decoration played, generally speaking, only a secondary part. The single elements, mostly low reliefs, had lost their integral connection with architectural functionalism and their rep-

representational meaning.² They were not part of an integral iconographic program; such programs were realized exclusively by means of painting. Reliefs, if they were not single icons, which were treated like painted panels, were included just for their decorative—one might almost say, coloristic—value; they were meant to enrich the surfaces of buildings and had no strictly defined place in the architectural system. A good example of this Byzantine manner of using sculpture is the Palaia Metropolis in Athens,³ one of the very few Byzantine churches which have retained their exterior decoration. It would be difficult to find a meaning, either functional or iconographic in this haphazard agglomeration of reliefs. Sculpture in Byzantium had lost a great deal of its importance for the realization of iconographic programs during the iconoclastic controversy and did not fully regain this importance until the Palaeologan period.⁴

The Venetians inherited this attitude from Byzantium together with the plunder from the eastern Mediterranean; and much of this attitude is mirrored in San Marco. On the exterior of the Tesoro and on the north façade especially, reliefs were set into the marble incrustation without much of an attempt to give them a functional or representational meaning. Most of them remained what they had been when they were shipped to Venice: spoils to be used for enriching the walls of the state church.

It is possible, indeed likely, that on the north façade (figs. 5, 33, 62) the juxtaposition of the reliefs representing the Sacrifice of Isaac and the Exploration of the Heavens by Alexander (Alexander the Great being borne up by griffins) was meant to express the contrast of Humility (the submission of Isaac to the sacrifice) and Superbia—the latter being the customary interpretation of the Alexander image in Romanesque art.⁵ As a matter of fact, the representation of Alexander's celestial journey occurs quite frequently in plastic decorations of mediaeval Italy. However, it is, hardly possible to fit into this iconographic program the third figure relief, a representation of St. George which is linked with the other two by its location, although this representation, too, is often found on Romanesque churches. What is missing is the link between St. George on the one hand and the Sacrifice and Alexander on the other. It is, moreover, possible that the representation of Alexander had for the Venetians yet another connotation: Alexander was the founder of, and had given his name to, the city from which the Venetians had derived the relics of their patron. It is not known

² This statement does not, of course, apply to Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, or Serbian art. Exceptions in Byzantium itself are few and far between, as far as architectural sculpture is concerned; it is, however, otherwise with "church furniture" in stone. For sepulchral sculpture, see A. Xyngopoulos, *Φραγκοβυζαντινά γλυπτά*.

³ J. Ebersolt, *Monuments*, p. 59, 168, pl. XX.

⁴ Good examples in the Kariye Camii, esp. the funeral monument of Michael Tornikes. L. Bréhier, *La sculpture*, pl. XIII.

⁵ On Alexander's Celestial Journey and its mediaeval representations in general, see: R. S. Loomis, "Treatment"; *idem*, "Alexander"; G. Boffitto, "Le Figurazioni"; G. Millet, "L'ascension"; G. Cary, "Alexander"; W. Stammer, "Alexander"; A. K. Orlandos, *Νέον ἀνάγλυφον*. On representations of Alexander in Italian mediaeval sculpture, see G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, p. 347ff., note 93. On the relief of San Marco itself: *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli V/1*, 64 (=pl. 42) and *Testo*, p. 254ff.; G. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 127f. The slab is also worked on the back, where it shows two peacocks.

whether two figures of angels (to the left and the right of the sepulchre of Manin; one of the thirteenth century, the other a copy of the nineteenth century), belonged to the decoration of the thirteenth century. If they did, they had hardly any specific meaning beyond their general iconographic significance. The same is true of a relief of the Virgin which is framed by an *aedicula* and is marred by restorations. The relief immediately above, showing two deer under trees in a similar *aedicula*, seems to have been set into the wall for purely decorative reasons; at least it is difficult to think of any interpretation, religious or political, that could have been applied to this work, which was clearly a fragment when it was set into the wall. The relief of the "Fortuna" or City-Goddess, on the other hand, is perhaps the most important piece of "political" sculpture on the façade (fig. 8). Of the other reliefs which were in all likelihood part of the north façade of the thirteenth century, only one has a clearly recognizable content, namely, the oblong plaque with the Hetoimasia and Lambs in the first large bay from the west (fig. 60). The others were meant as mere decorative enrichments of the façade.

The north façade of the thirteenth century, with its wealth of columns, friezes of small reliefs, and colorful incrustation, has not, however, come down to us in anything like its original form—which undoubtedly showed a certain regular rhythm. In the fourteenth century a large Gothic window was opened in the third bay and new pieces of decor, mostly taken from the interior of the church were added at later periods. The reliefs of Christ and the evangelists (figs. 7, 44–47), for example, were apparently transferred to the north façade when the thirteenth-century screen (or iconostasis), of which they seem to have formed part, was replaced at the end of the fourteenth century by the new and still extant screen of the Massegne.⁶ The reliefs of St. John and St. Leonard (figs. 48, 49) which had served as "altar panels" of the transept altars, were transferred to the façade perhaps as late as 1617/18, when the dedications of these altars were changed.⁷ Thus, the present aspect of the north façade is, as regards its sculptural decor, a product of chance and of the vicissitudes of taste. In this respect it is typically Venetian. It is not functional architecture with a decoration embodying a well-ordered program, but just a colorfully adorned wing on the stage of charmingly casual Venice.

The south façade of the church (fig. 3) differs from the north façade in that it was designed for a specific function. It is even less logically arranged than the north façade and its decor does not, to be sure, express what could be called an iconographic program of religious significance. At first glance, the sole aim of the Venetians seems to have been to make this view of the church as rich and as costly as possible. But this assemblage of decorative wealth on the south façade of San Marco is in itself meaningful; it is in a way the main prospect of the church, its "official" façade, facing, as it does, the approach from the sea and from the Palace of the Doges.

This façade, too, was altered almost beyond recognition, not only by a very

⁶ F. Kieslinger, *Le transenne*.

⁷ O. Demus, "Zwei marmorne Altarikonnen."

unfortunate nineteenth-century restoration campaign, but also by many earlier changes. In the fourteenth century a door and two windows were opened in the south façade to give access and light to the Baptistery. In the sixteenth century the great south door, which had been one of the main entrances to the church, was blocked up by the altar of the funerary chapel built for Cardinal Giovanni Battista Zeno, a chapel which replaced the antevestibulum. At the same time, most of the major sculptural decorations of the porch were apparently removed. Some were destroyed, but others were transferred to the interior of the chapel—witness the two couchant lions (fig. 98) which must have flanked the entrance. Some of the reliefs of the upper archivolt and the two griffins on columns were left in their places.

It was the "official" character of the south façade with its approach from the sea that lent a specific meaning to the spoils which were exhibited there: these became "spoils" *par excellence*, or, more correctly, *trophies*. The trophies of the thirteenth century were won in the wars against Byzantium (the Fourth Crusade) and against Genoa. From Byzantium were taken, in all likelihood, the porphyry group of the Tetrarchs, the porphyry head on the balustrade of the upper story (the so-called Carmagnola), most of the relief slabs set into the walls of the Tesoro (fig. 25), the "patere" of precious marble and onyx, and, of course, most of the columns and capitals. Trophies of the Genoese wars are the two famous pillars and the *Pietra del bando*, all taken from Acre by Lorenzo Tiepolo in 1258. Both the pillars and the *Pietra* had a highly political significance:⁸ the former had served as door posts of a Genoese fortress (San Saba); the latter had been the symbol of Genoese jurisdiction. The political significance of the position of the two pillars was more clearly patent when, as seems to have been the case in the thirteenth century, they actually flanked the official entrance of the south side, now replaced by the external wall of the Zeno chapel. No other location could be more emphatic than that of the *Pietra del bando*, at the southwest corner of the church.

The main façade of the church, facing west, is the only one which is more or less logically decorated (fig. 2). Its decor is neither an almost meaningless, if rhythmical, agglomeration of single reliefs, like that of the north façade, nor an artistically amorphous accumulation of trophies, like that of the south. Its ingredients are trophies, spoils, copies of imported pieces, and entire cycles of newly created sculptures—the whole being arranged according to a definite, if somewhat loosely-knit plan.

Everything that was affixed to the west façade in the thirteenth century was made to appear as an integral part of this program. Even the famous horses were, in all likelihood, not just precious spoils, works of art meant to increase the wealth and the beauty of the church. They were incorporated into the formal entity of the façade by being placed symmetrically on columnar pedestals in front of the west window, so that they appeared as gleaming forms against the dark background of the intercolumniations. The mosaic of the Porta Sant'Alip-

⁸ G. Saccardo, "I pilastri"; M. Kalligas, *Oi Περσολ* (an attempt to date the Acre pillars in the twelfth century). See also part I, note 100.

pio not only shows their original state, but clarifies the artistic intention of the leading decorator or architect who was responsible for their location. Thematically speaking, the four horses belong to the sphere of triumphal art: they reminded the mediaeval spectator of the quadrigas that crowned triumphal arches in Roman times.⁹

More intimately connected with the architecture are six reliefs, set into the spandrels between the great arches of the façade (figs. 2, 38-43). At first glance they too might appear as so many spoils, meaningless, if not in themselves, at least in their juxtaposition. A closer inspection, however, makes it clear that only two of them are spoils from Byzantium, while the others were made in Venice, expressly and to measure, in order to fit their places and to form, together with the imported pieces which were spoils, an artistic and iconographic whole.

Spoils and expressly created works are also combined in the decoration of the side doors. The only one of these decorations which has come down to us in its entirety is that of the Porta Sant'Alipio. It is also the only one which has preserved its old mosaic (fig. 10). The corresponding door at the extreme right has been despoiled of some of its plastic elements; the other two were fundamentally altered by the large tracery windows which replaced the original tympana in the fourteenth century. However, the decoration of the Porta Sant'Alipio is sufficient to demonstrate the eclecticism which was the fundamental characteristic of the Venetian decorators: high and flat relief, light, dark, and greenish stone, perforated slabs and lattices, mosaic and gilding—everything was made to contribute towards a general effect of richness. Of figure sculpture alone, three widely differing types are used side by side: flat, trellised reliefs serve as a frame and cover the surface into which the ogee arch of the tympanum is cut; square or circular slabs with single figures (St. George and the symbols of the evangelists) are set into the ground of the tympanum itself; and below is a deeply carved lintel with figures and scenes in niches. In spite of the diversity of the various parts and the fact that not all of these parts appear to have been made for this purpose, the decor of the tympanum is a unified whole, welded together by the unerring instinct of the Venetians for coloristic and decorative unity.

There is yet another species of sculpture to be found in the decoration of the west façade of San Marco. It consists of arches, carved in relief of varying depth, arranged around the central porch (fig. 65) as a multiple framework which encloses not only the door itself but also the apse-like niche with the restored mosaic of the Last Judgement. As a matter of fact, this mosaic is an integral part of the decoration, contributing to its formal and decorative unity, as well as to its iconographic unity. Here we find an example of that "concert of the arts" which would have to be called unusual in any place other than Venice.

⁹ This aspect has been kindly brought to my attention by Professor André Grabar, who has also communicated to me his idea that it was, perhaps, the quadriga, placed above the entrance of the Hippodrome of Constantinople, which invited imitation in provincial and colonial cities, e.g. in Kiev, where Vladimir placed four "copper" horses (taken from the Chersonese) next to his palace, behind the Desyatinnaya church.

In all but two instances, the "backbone" of the relief consists of intertwined tendrils. The carving rises from flat relief to almost full plastic volume. These reliefs are, perhaps, the most "normal" examples of architectural sculpture of the late Romanesque and early Gothic periods that can be found on the façades of San Marco.

Among the sculptures of the interior of the church the protomes adorning the corbels of the arcuated frieze fall in the same category (fig. 23).

II. VENETIAN SCULPTURE BEFORE 1200

1. *Interlaced Patterns and Rinceaux*. Ornamental Venetian sculpture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries was dominated by three forces: the weight of the early mediaeval tradition, which had remained alive in the northeastern corner of Italy, middle Byzantine influences, and the influence of Islamic art. The first of these three currents is characterized by the fact that its repertory consists almost exclusively of interlace patterns to which are added conventionalized symbols. Carved in stone in a "two-plane technique" the interlace achieves an almost coloristic effect of light, tripartite bands on a dark ground. Coloristically speaking, the reliefs in this technique are not unlike those works in niello or inlay, which are to be found throughout San Marco, notably in the capitals and friezes of the eleventh-century Contarini church. But there is a profound difference in the formal character of the patterns and in the derivation of the two groups: the "niello" technique, with its repertory of running or all-over patterns is Byzantine in origin and, at least in the beginning, was certainly introduced and used by Greek workmen, whereas the interlaced bands are primarily Italian. It is true that Byzantine art knew and used interlaced patterns very frequently; but both the patterns and the bands are different. In Byzantium the former show mostly centralized motifs and the latter consist not of three strips as in the West, but of two strips only. Venetian artisans used almost without exception the band of three strips; thus the style of these works was not inspired by Byzantium but was a provincial product of Italian evolution, derived, perhaps, from Grado rather than from Ravenna. Cattaneo and Professor Åberg have assigned a ninth-century date to some of the Italian slabs with interlaced bands that are found in San Marco, thus connecting them with the first church of *ca.* 830.¹⁰

In the case of some terracotta and stone friezes with tendrils and interlaced bands (fig. 31) we can go even further: the origin of the workmen who made these friezes can be determined by the fact that exactly the same forms, possibly even the same moulds, were used in Pomposa a few years earlier.¹¹ That this style, imported from the former exarchate, together with the Byzantine niello technique, should have partially dominated the art of the eleventh century in Venice is not altogether strange.

¹⁰ R. Cattaneo, *L'architettura, passim*; N. Åberg, "The Orient," II, p. 34, fig. 30. On the earliest Venetian decorative sculpture in stone, in general, see H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 63 ff. which contains also the earlier bibliography, and O. Demus, "Zwei Dogengräber."

¹¹ R. Cattaneo, in: *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 174 ff. See also *supra*, p. 89 and note 123.

On the other hand, it seems strange that this same art was still practiced there up to the very end of the twelfth century, when it was already obsolete in the regions west of Venice. This adherence to an antiquated art can be explained only by the peripheral situation of Venice and by the fact that no great building activity seems to have taken place there in the twelfth century, at least by comparison with the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries. Interlace patterns with three strips were used even in much later times, for instance in the decoration of wellheads (*vere da pozzo*), the patterns of which were copied again and again from early mediaeval models—in some isolated cases even down to the fifteenth century. The longevity of this art in Venice can perhaps be adduced in explanation of the fact that the Romanesque sculptors of the Alpine regions used equally antiquated patterns as late as the end of the twelfth century. It may have been Venetian influence that kept these forms alive in an otherwise rapidly changing art.¹²

It has been said above that the Venetian interlace patterns are different from those evolved and used in Byzantium. This does not, however, mean that the Byzantine brand of plait work is not to be found in Venice. It can be seen in San Marco in both spoils and Venetian works that were inspired by Byzantine originals (fig. 25).

The difference in feeling and execution between Byzantine and Venetian decorative sculpture can perhaps be best clarified if some of the relief slabs of San Marco are compared with the *cancelli* of the iconostasis of the cathedral of Torcello. The comparable Venetian *plutei* are found forming the balustrade of the ambulatory on either side of the nave in the western crossarm. Four of these reliefs—three on the south and one on the north—are clearly the work of one artist whose hand is recognizable by his rather dry, sharply defined, and unusually “hard” manner. Two of these reliefs show lions, one peacocks, and the fourth deer, all more or less symmetrically arranged in antithetic foliage (fig. 30). At first glance these reliefs might be classed as Byzantine; on closer inspection, however, they reveal themselves as Venetian imitations, especially if they are carefully compared with the Torcello reliefs mentioned above. The latter have been connected with the rebuilding of the cathedral in 1008 and the San Marco reliefs have, therefore, been dated after the fire of 976, which would make them part of the Orseolo rebuilding of the church. However, the hardness and dryness of the Venetian reliefs with their finicky forms argue for a later date. Thus, it is most likely that the reliefs of this group were made in connection with the great rebuilding of San Marco under Contarini and his followers, towards the end of the eleventh century. In addition to the hardness of detail, the work shows a decisive attempt to break up the classical symmetry of the Byzantine prototypes, a fact that is the more

¹² M. G. Zimmermann, *Oberitalische Plastik*; R. Kautzsch, “Die Langobardische Schmuckkunst”; K. Ginhardt, “Karolingische und frühromanische Werkstücke,” esp. p. 218f., fig. 55ff. The longevity of the “Longobardic” interlace in Venice may be gauged best from the curious wellhead signed by Cristofolo di Martin and dated 1467, which copies an original of the twelfth century: R. Cattaneo, *Architettura*, p. 328, fig. 160; A. Colasanti and C. Ricci, *L'art byzantin*, pl. 82; further examples in F. Ongania (ed.), *Raccolta, passim*. Cf. also G. DeFrancovich, “Il problema,” and D. Dalla Barba Brusin, *Scultura*.

remarkable since the Venetian artist seems to have been striving to make his compositions grander and clearer. The difference between the two groups is not one between organic and abstract art but one that distinguishes the work of the master from that of the gifted pupil. The former may be described as simple, "classical," harmonious; the latter as nervous, complicated, and outré, with disturbing gaps in the composition.

The San Marco group of reliefs is a good example of what Venetian imitations of Byzantine originals were like in the late eleventh century. But there is yet another kind of decorative sculpture to be found in San Marco: the patterned screens in the small windows above the side doors of the western façade, those in the central apse, and in the ducal sepulchres of the atrium (figs. 26-29). The origin of these patterns cannot be easily defined. In addition to undoubtedly Byzantine elements, especially in some of the screens of the ducal graves, and to preromanesque patterns, there are others which were imported from the Islamic East or imitated after oriental models. The Byzantine elements in the eleventh-century screens are more closely related to sixth or seventh century work, e.g., that of Ravenna, than to mid-Byzantine models. We do not yet know enough about the evolution of local sculpture to determine whether this relationship is one of survival or revival, although the latter seems more likely. In any case, the highly refined forms of Justinianic art were simplified and coarsened in this process.

As regards those screens for which an Islamic parentage can be assumed, they show some resemblance to North Italian plait work, but are more refined than the latter. Kautzsch has stressed their more "intellectual and sophisticated" character. In the thirteenth century some of these patterns were repeated in a technique combining low relief with mosaic, witness, for instance, the small arches of the tympanum of the door (or window) at the extreme right of the main façade.¹³

2. *Lombardo-Emilian Sculpture.* The preponderance of ornament in Venetian stone and terracotta sculpture of the eleventh and twelfth centuries did not preclude the occasional appearance of representational sculpture. The most important—indeed the only important—works of this kind are the vigorous and, in part, even masterly groups at the corners of the pedestals of the two Piazzetta columns, which were set up by Nicolò dei Barattieri in the seventies of the twelfth century. The deplorable state of these sculptures today makes it difficult to appreciate the impressive combination of an almost fully developed sense of plastic freedom with a severe discipline in preserving the unbroken surface of the original block from which the groups were carved with a minimum of "waste." The subject matter of these groups, which repre-

¹³ On imitations of Byzantine *plutei* in San Marco, see, M. Lawrence, "Two Ravennate Monuments," p. 134; on the Torcello reliefs, A. Haseloff, *Pre-Romanesque Sculpture*, p. 70f., pl. 79, and S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 27. A study of the Torcello iconostasis and ambo is still lacking (see O. Demus, "Zwei Dogengräber"). On the essential difference between Longobardic and Islamic patterns, see R. Kautzsch, "Die römische Schmuckkunst," p. 71, fig. 104f., and *supra* p. 104, note 171.

sent the various trades and professions of the Venetian people, might even suggest Venetian origin, since the same theme was treated a hundred years later by one of the greatest Venetian sculptors on the outer arch of the central porch of San Marco. However, there exist no other examples of this art in twelfth-century Venice, as contrasted with numerous examples in Lombardy; so it must be assumed that the master (or masters) came from the West, a fact which is attested for Nicolò dei Barattieri by Sanudo.

The following subjects are represented on the "Todaro" column: NW, smiths forging iron; SW, fishermen selling fish; SE, basketmakers (?); NE, wine sellers. On the "Lion" column we find: NW, fruitsellers; SW, butchers selling meat; NE, cattle dealers. The sculptures on the SE side are destroyed, but two seated figures are still visible, as in the other groups.

Perhaps even earlier, though much less impressive in quality, are the figure representations of the stoup of Torcello Cathedral. On the strength of its decor inlaid in niello technique, this object may well be considered Venetian work of the late eleventh or early twelfth century. If this is true, it may serve to gauge the degree to which the Venetians of this early period lacked the specific qualities required for sculpture in the round. The earlier heads and protomes of the corbel table of San Marco itself—especially those of the main walls—are rather crude works which are difficult to date exactly; however, they belong most likely to the middle or the second half of the twelfth century.

Except for these San Marco has preserved very few indigenous, or even Italian, works of a representational character, which could be dated in the eleventh or twelfth century. The few that remain are to be seen on the west façade of the church and may be classed as remnants of the eleventh-century façade. Among these are the two small caryatids which support the outer elements of the great arch framing the central doorway. These are primitive figures in strong contrast with the elegant reliefs of the neighboring arch. The gargoyle at the north corner may also be eleventh-century work. So, perhaps, is the stone with two lions in high relief (fig. 38) which serves as a kind of pedestal for the relief of Heracles with the boar. However, this may well be of later date.¹⁴

III. VENETIAN SCULPTURE IN THE EARLY THIRTEENTH CENTURY

1. *The early Antelami Workshop.* The first extensive activity in the field of figurative sculpture that took place in San Marco must have begun about the turn of the century or soon thereafter. The main product of the workshop which was then active in San Marco is the second series of protomes which support the corbel table of the secondary walls—and, as the latest additions,

¹⁴ On Venetian twelfth-century sculpture, see P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 894, note 31 and p. 895, note 35. On the erection of the Piazzetta columns by Nicolò dei Barattieri (a Lombard according to Sanudo), see F. Sansovino, *Venetia*, p. 116; on the corner sculptures, O. Mothes, *Geschichte*, I, p. 138f. There is as yet no monograph on these important works. The stoup of Torcello Cathedral is reproduced in H. Decker, *Venedig*, fig. 9, text p. 18; O. Mothes, *ibid.*, p. 55.

those in the cupola piers (figs. 19, 23, 97).¹⁵ Numerous artists were, of course, responsible for the great number of human and animal heads, and there exist, accordingly, pronounced differences in kind and in artistic merit among the various groups. One thing, however, is common to most of those that are not definitely Venetian, namely, their Lombardo-Emilian character in general, and their connection with the Antelamesque current in particular. The latter term must, it is true, be taken in its widest meaning, so as to embrace not only the sculpture of Benedetto himself and of his workshop, but also the artistic background from which the art of Antelami grew, and its wide radiation. The task of carving so great a number of heads, not many of them identical in shape and expression, must have been excellent training for the members of the workshop; it almost inaugurated a new departure in Venetian art. One of the sculptors of these heads, which were originally gilded, must also have been one of the masters who executed the reliefs of the second arch of the main door of the west façade, since the heads that support the corbel table of the southwest pier of the central cupola are exactly the same as the heads of some of the allegories of the months e.g. March and April. The entire work seems to have progressed clockwise starting from the west end of the north aisle of the west arm.

To the Antelamesque movement belong also the four angels of the central square (figs. 99, 100). The eastern pair, which includes the best of these figures—the angel blowing the trumpet—must have been made by a younger collaborator of Benedetto himself, an artist who was certainly not very inferior to Antelami in creative power and elegance, and who was even more “modern” than he. The hand of this artist can be discerned in at least one, if not two, further sculptures representing angels; one supports the lectern of the great northern pulpit (fig. 102); the other, a shade weaker and perhaps a copy of the first, is a half figure in high relief set into the wall of the Baptistery. Both display a somewhat more mature style than the angel with the trumpet and, therefore, must be later. Their date may be the second quarter of the thirteenth century.

The clumsy collaborator of this very able artist also took his lead from Antelami. The attitudes and gestures of his two angels are anticipated by the angels of the Parma Baptistery.¹⁶ If this parallel serves to establish the provenance of his style, another parallel serves to date his work and shows the subsequent fate of his art. Most of the traits peculiar to this artist are to be found in the sculptural decor of the main porch of Trogir (Traù) Cathedral, signed by one Magister Raduanus (Radovan) and dated 1240.¹⁷ It will be

¹⁵ On the protomes of the corbel table, see *supra*, p. 84 and *infra* p. 157. Plaster casts of a few heads are kept in a hall in San Basso. A similar use of protomes, perhaps-inspired by San Marco, is made in Dečani, Serbia. M. Pupin, *Dečani*, pls. I ff.

¹⁶ See *supra*, p. 84 note 107. On the related angels of the Parma baptistery see G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, I, pp. 167, 169, and *passim*; II, figs. 240, 241. The arrangement of the Venetian angels in the four corners of the central square (under the pendentives) has an interesting parallel in Sainte Foy in Conques, of the twelfth century: J. Gantner, M. Pobé, and J. Roubier, *Gallia romanica*, fig. 136.

¹⁷ C. Fisković, *Radovan*; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 671, note 88 (bibliography); see also *infra*, p. 156.

shown below that Radovan transplanted from Venice to Trogir many elements of style and a few motifs. In view of the many links which connect his work with that of the "Master of the Clumsy Angels," we are forced to conclude that Radovan and at least one of his collaborators received their training in Venice and that one of them was responsible for the two western angels of the central square. The foursquare stance of these figures, the mechanically undulating seams of the garments, even the principal motifs of the drapery are repeated in some of the Trogir figures, especially the apostles on the extreme left.

Next to the central square of San Marco, the south porch seems to have been one of the main foci for sculpture in the round. Of the plastic decor which enriched the great open doorway (later remodelled as the Zeno chapel) only the two magnificent lions of the Zeno chapel and two griffins are left today (fig. 98). The lions are descended from those of Ferrara Cathedral, but are more organic and more realistic in build and movement; their nearest relatives are, in fact, Antelami's lions in Parma (episcopal throne of the cathedral and baptismal font of the Baptistery).¹⁸ The griffins of the south façade were heavily restored in the nineteenth century.

The impact of the Lombard movement of functional sculpture on the one hand, and, on the other hand, of the Antelamesque current of sculpture in the round, with its feeling for organic structure and movement, might have started an early development of functional sculpture in Venice, had not this development been profoundly disturbed, indeed, all but drowned, by an influx of spoils, mainly from Byzantium and from the eastern Mediterranean in general. This new wealth, heaped by the Venetians upon their national church, almost destroyed the feeling for a logical and organic function of sculpture in an architectural setting.

2. *Spoils and Imports.* It is difficult to say specifically at what time any given piece of Byzantine sculpture, that is now preserved in San Marco or elsewhere in Venice, was brought to that city. Some pieces may have been transported there before 1100 as gifts, others as spoils of the military expeditions of the twelfth century; others were not acquired until the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. But the bulk reached Venice with the booty of the Fourth Crusade. It must not be thought, however, that this booty was brought to Venice in one lot immediately after the Impresa of Constantinople in 1204. This may hold true for the most precious part of the booty, reliquaries and other goldsmith work, but the pillaging of Constantinopolitan churches continued to the middle of the thirteenth century, witness the dates of some *translationes* of relics from Constantinople and other towns of the former Byzantine Empire.

It was, in any case, in the first half of the thirteenth century that Venice felt the impact of Byzantine influence most strongly, in the field of sculpture as much as in other fields. It has been said above that a large part of these spoils

¹⁸ G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, figs. 221f., 286; R. Julian, *L'éveil*, pls. LXXXV/4 and XCI/2.

was used as material for decoration in the most general sense, that is, as spoils without any attempt at giving them a new meaning; others received a special accent as trophies, and still others were endowed with an even more specific political or religious meaning.

A number of spoils taken to Venice in the first half of the thirteenth century were acquired because of their supposed value as relics and were treated accordingly. One example is the stone from which Christ was purported to have preached, or on which He rested during His discourse with the Woman of Samaria.¹⁹ The most interesting example of this kind is a relief of the enthroned Virgin in the Cappella Zeno. Owing to a curious misreading of an inscription, it was believed by the Venetians to be a part of the stone from which Moses miraculously drew water in the desert (fig. 35). This relief, however, cannot have reached Venice before the last quarter of the thirteenth century.²⁰

Aniketos

The most important group of Byzantine reliefs as regards both their iconographic significance and their effect on the stylistic evolution of Venetian sculpture, is that of the "icons," the images of saints or the Virgin originally destined for worship and simply reinstated to their former function after their transfer to Venice. San Marco is not the only Venetian or Adriatic church to have received images of this kind; the churches of Sta Maria Mater Domini, SS. Giovanni e Paolo, S. Trovaso, and Sta Maria in Porto in Ravenna also possess excellent examples.²¹ Those icons that fell to the share of the ducal church assumed a special religious importance, most of them, like the Madonna della Grazia, the Madonna del Bacio, or the Madonna dello Schioppo (a later Venetian work), becoming in due course highly popular images. In addition, the icons initiated a local school which began by imitating them. Some of these imitations were so successful that, given our present knowledge of Byzantine sculpture, it is doubtful whether they are Byzantine originals, Venetian copies, or intermediary phenomena, that is to say, works created by Greek sculptors in Venice, or Byzantine originals "restored," worked over, or adapted by Venetian workmen.

icone della V.

Some of the Byzantine icons that came to San Marco as spoils from Constantinople will be analyzed and contrasted with Venetian works later on. A few observations must, however, be made here with regard to general characteristic differences between works of the two groups, especially with regard to the relationship of the figure to the "picture surface" and to the frame. Although

¹⁹ See G. B. Contarini, *Spiegazione*, p. 129f. A. Pasini, *Guide*, p. 222. The stone which is in the Baptistery was supposed to have been taken from Sidon to Venice by Doge Domenico Michiel in 1126: A. Dandolo *Chronicon*, ed. A. Muratori, p. 271.

²⁰ See *infra*, p. 187f.; G. B. Contarini, *Spiegazione*, p. 139f.; A. Pasini, *Guide*, p. 238; S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 26; the relief was seen and described by the pilgrim Jean de Tournay in 1487: B. de la Fons-Melicoq, "Voyage," p. 134.

²¹ Venice, Sta Maria Mater Domini: H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 134, fig. 4; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 38, fig. 7; *ibid.*, fig. 8, a half-length figure in relief in the Abbazia della Misericordia. The Annunciation on the façade of SS. Giovanni e Paolo: P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 791, fig. 517; S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 41. Relief of St. Peter near S. Trovaso: O. Demus, "Zwei marmorne Altarikenonen"; Reliefs of Agathonikos and Georgios (the latter Venetian) in Caorle, Cathedral: *loc. cit.* and S. Bettini, *op. cit.* p. 34f. Maria Orans in Sta Maria in Porto, Ravenna: O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und Byzantinische Kunst*, p. 607, fig. 516.

it does happen now and then that Byzantine relief figures seem to transcend their allotted space by overlapping their frames through an extended hand or an advancing foot, the frames rarely seem to hem in the figures too closely or to confine them to too narrow a space. There is always a certain amplitude about the empty space that surrounds the figures and from which they freely detach themselves. The proportions of the frames make the figures appear broader than they actually are. In Venetian works, on the other hand, there is a feeling of narrowness and compactness which is also a characteristic quality of Romanesque sculpture. The high and narrow frames compress the lengthened figures so much that the figures seem to be squeezed in from all sides. A Venetian relief will more often than not look "uncomfortable" compared with the noble and disciplined "naturalness" of a Byzantine work of similar quality. There are, of course, extreme cases of assimilation, and the critic should not rely too firmly on single characteristics.

Difficulties in distinguishing imported from Venetian sculptures exist also with regard to those that show an Early Christian style (see *infra*, p. 165 ff.) and, finally, with regard to Venetian decorative reliefs of Byzantine and Oriental derivation. It is common knowledge that decorative pieces with "Byzantine" and "Oriental" motifs were fabricated in Venice as late as the fifteenth century for the decoration of palace façades. This fashion must have been inspired by a mass importation of original pieces, which have now been lost in the still greater mass of Venetian imitations.

No such doubts as to date or provenance exist with regard to several purely Byzantine works. One of these is the "Trimorphon," a relief of the Deesis with a standing figure of Christ flanked by the Virgin and St. John, which is set into the wall of the south aisle, next to the door that leads into the Baptistery (fig. 32). Popular piety invented a romantic story about this relief, which consists of three separate marble panels. According to the story, a sculptor, commissioned by Diocletian to make images of Jupiter, Juno, and Mercury, created instead the three figures of Christ, the Virgin, and the Baptist, and suffered martyrdom in consequence. Actually, however, the reliefs must be spoils from Byzantium. This is borne out not only by the exceedingly sharp, linear folds which are incised in the surface, but also by the types of the figures, and, especially, of the ornamental motifs which show the Greek style of the late tenth or the eleventh century in so pure a form that it is impossible to think of them as imitations. Certain technical details of the reliefs also point to Byzantium. The slight inequality of size between the center panel and the side panels makes it quite clear that the reliefs were not meant to be set side by side but that they were destined to be separated by some intervening elements, pillars, columns, or the like. The most probable setting of the three reliefs in their original Byzantine context would have been in an iconostasis or templon: the standing figure of Christ, of the type known as "Chalkites," would have been above the central door and the two others above the side doors. In this form the relief may have adorned one of the churches which were sacked by the Crusaders in 1204.

A similar provenance and, probably, a similar use can be assumed for the re-

lief, now in the Cappella della Nicopeia, which shows two youthful saints (Cosmas and Damian?) standing under an arcade topped by three busts (fig. 34). The framework is indeed very similar to that of the Trimorphon. However, the date of this relief must be considerably later than that of the "Trimorphon." The more conventional lines the bulging contours, and the eggshaped heads place this relief in the Comnenian period, most probably in the second half of the twelfth century, thus making it contemporary with two reliefs with which it is closely related in style, the Alexander image of the north façade and the emperor of the Campiello Angaran.²²

IV. THE ASSIMILATION OF FOREIGN MODELS AND THE BIRTH OF VENETIAN SCULPTURE

1. *The Influence of Byzantine Sculpture.* Of all the elements and tendencies present in Venice in the first half of the thirteenth century—the surviving art of early mediaeval ornamentation, the rising movement of Antelamesque sculpture, the importation of Byzantine, Early Christian, and Oriental models—it was the influx of Byzantine reliefs and, perhaps, the immigration of Byzantine artists that most strongly affected the technical and stylistic training of the Venetian sculptors. The gradual growth of the local artists' ability first to imitate and then to emulate Byzantine sculpture can be followed in San Marco almost step by step. For instance, no less than eight reliefs of Byzantine origin or derivation which depict the standing Virgin in full figure are to this day preserved in San Marco; quite a few more are in other Venetian and Adriatic churches.²³

The comparatively large number of reliefs of the standing Virgin in San Marco can be explained in several different ways which are not mutually exclusive. Some of these panels may have been set into the walls of San Marco in relatively recent times as pious donations; others may have had from the very beginning a special function and meaning. To cite one example only: the brotherhood of the Virgin (later called the Confraternità dei Mascoli), which since the thirteenth century met in the Crypt and later in the Chapel of the Mascoli, most certainly had its own icon, probably that which is at present set into the wall next to their chapel (fig. 37). Some of the reliefs had special significance even before they came to San Marco. For instance, the *Madonna della Grazia* (fig. 36)—to say nothing of the *Nikopeia*—had surely been a much venerated icon in Byzantium. Others, like the Orant Virgin of the façade, received their religious

²² The Deesis of San Marco, which was regarded as Venetian twelfth-century work by H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 137 (fig. 5), and P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 791, is more correctly defined as Byzantine, early eleventh century, by O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und Byzantinische Kunst* p. 606, fig. 514, and, rightly, as belonging to the "Romanus-group" by S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 38 (fig. p. 40). The legend is told by, among others, Nicolò Doglioni in 1662 (*La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 260). The relief with two standing figures and three busts in the Cappella della Nicopeia is reproduced *ibid.*, *Dettagli*, V/6, P. 3 (= pl. 279). On the emperor relief of the Campiello Angaran (and its counterpart in Dumbarton Oaks), see H. Peirce and R. Tyler, "Three Byzantine Works," and S. Bettini, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

²³ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 270ff.; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 132; N. P. Kondakov, *Ikonografiya Bogomateri*, II, p. 85f.

meaning from the place they were given in the context of the entire decoration. Such reasons easily account for the eight icons of the standing Virgin, without our being forced to assume that any of them — except possibly the "latecomers" alluded to above — were regarded as purely decorative and devoid of specific meaning.

The earliest of these reliefs of the Virgin, or, at least, the most purely Byzantine in iconography and style, is the Orant in the north aisle (fig. 36).²⁴ The relief is defaced by gilding and was probably reworked at some later time. Thus the fluted halo may be the result of an alteration. Yet the essentially Byzantine character of the relief is still apparent. Though it is not of the first quality, it shares with Byzantine works of the eleventh century the severe and meticulous drapery composed of straight lines with only a minimum of curves.²⁵ This does not mean, however, that the relief is necessarily an eleventh-century work. The lack of finesse and precision might argue for a later date, but it is safe to assume that it was made in Byzantium and reached Venice as a part of the Crusaders' booty.

Very close in style to this relief is another, on the inner west wall of the south aisle, above the Porta San Clemente.²⁶ As it is symmetrically flanked by two candelabra in *opus sectile*, it must be considered a part of the thirteenth-century incrustation of the wall,²⁷ a supposition further supported by the fact that the corresponding motif above the Porta San Pietro in the north aisle is an inlaid cross, a symbol for Christ. The relief of the Orant is a close approximation to, even a copy of the Madonna della Grazia in the north aisle. The drapery is somewhat simplified and the two ends of the girdle hang in undulating lines. This is surely a Venetian work made expressly for its present place.

The same prototype was followed by the Venetian copyist who made the Madonna on the west face of the northwest pier of the main cupola, and who was possibly the sculptor of the Orant above the Porta San Clemente.²⁸ However, in this figure there are new, characteristically Venetian elements, especially in its expression, and human appeal. The face is fuller and softer and it is turned slightly sideways. The lines of the drapery are simpler than in the other relief of this group, but show a tendency towards undulating forms. The folds have lost their hard definition; they do not appear as if incised with a knife; the modelling is softer. If the forms of this figure were more elaborate, the result would be something like the Madonna on the west façade, which, however, followed a different prototype. Again very similar in type is the Orant Madonna next to the Cappella dei Mascoli (fig. 37). An interesting feature of this

²⁴ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, fig. h on p. 138. The relief is venerated as Mater gratiae or Madonna della Grazia.

²⁵ On Byzantine marble reliefs of the Orant Virgin, see J. Strykowski, "Die Maria Orans," p. 8 ff.; N. P. Kondakov, *Ikongrafiya Bogomateri*, II, p. 85 ff.; C. Diehl, *Manuel*, II, p. 652 ff. The Venetian example is inferior in quality to the fine relief in the Istanbul Museum, discovered in 1920 (reprod. in D. T. Rice, *Byzantine Art*, pl. 28 and S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 34; first published by A. Müfid Mansel, "Erwerbungsbericht," fig. 10).

²⁶ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/6, M. 11 (= pl. 240).

²⁷ See the forthcoming volume on the mosaics.

²⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/6, N. 3 (= pl. 253).

Orant is the frame, an arched *aedicula* with foliage filling the spandrels of the upper corners. Almost identical *aediculae* serve as frames of four mosaic figures of saints in the aisles of the western crossarm, namely, Paul the Martyr, Gerard, Paul the Hermit, and Hilary. The prototype of this frame may have been provided by a Byzantine relief such as the Orant with Christ in a medallion (a Blachernitissa or Kyriotissa) in the Venetian church of Sta Maria Mater Domini, a work of excellent quality.²⁹

All these orant reliefs of San Marco, with the possible exception of the last, antedate the relief of the west façade. They show that the mannerist phase of paraphrasing Byzantine models, which the Virgin of the west façade exemplifies, was preceded by a phase during which Byzantine prototypes³⁰ were carefully copied and cautiously varied.

This copying of Byzantine models was, so to speak, the training ground of Venetian sculptors in the first half of the thirteenth century. To this same period may belong a group of Italo-Byzantine ivories which was attributed to Venice by A. S. Keck and assigned by him to a date shortly after 1200. Further study is, however, needed to corroborate this attribution. The ivories are imitations of Byzantine originals of the tenth to the twelfth century, or "translations" into ivory carving of compositions evolved in the sphere of monumental painting.³¹

2. *The Byzantinizing Current and the Antelami Workshop.* A. THE ICONS OF THE WEST FAÇADE. The reliefs considered so far have been variations on a theme, exercises in copying, or, at least, in closely approximating given models. They are not connected with each other by an evolutionary thread, but refer, each singly, to a prototype, and thus circumscribe, as it were, the range within which imitators worked. This is not so with the six icons in the spandrels of the arches of the west façade (figs. 2, 38-43). Of these the ones made in Venice are, with one exception, products of one workshop, even of one master, and are thus parts of a sequence in time, showing consecutive stages in the process of assimilating foreign models.

The six reliefs, belonging as they do to various periods and containing widely differing subject matter, might at first be taken as so many spoils used for the adornment of the façade in a more or less haphazard way. What, for instance, could be the general idea connecting representations of Heracles with the Erymanthian boar, the Virgin in the attitude of an orant, St. George seated on a chair and either drawing his sword or replacing it in its scabbard, St. Demetrius in the same attitude, the Archangel Gabriel and, finally, Heracles with the stag and the hydra? And yet, these six reliefs constitute an organic program, despite the fact that two of them are spoils taken from different contexts, and the others local products.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, N. 11 (= pl. 258). For the relief of Sta Maria Mater Domini, see *supra*, note 21.

³⁰ For the later development of Byzantinizing sculpture in Venice, see *infra*, p. 187 f. and L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," pp. 33, 41; *idem*, *Die Estensische Kunstsammlung*, pp. 9 ff., 40 f. (pl. X). Further orant Madonnas: San Marco north façade (now replaced by a nineteenth-century copy) and S. Giovanni Crisostomo (H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 132).

³¹ A. S. Keck, "A Group."

It can be proved that the six reliefs occupied their present places at least as early as 1267. The only original mosaic of the west façade, that above the Porta Sant' Alipio (fig. 10) with the solemn translation of St. Mark's relics into the church, shows the reliefs already *in situ* on the façade which forms the background of the scene. To be sure, in the mosaic the reliefs are not rendered accurately, but indicated merely as upright rectangles filled with conventional designs; yet there can be no doubt that they are meant to represent the six reliefs. As has been mentioned above, the Chronicle of Martino da Canale provides an approximate *terminus ad quem* for this mosaic, hence the reliefs were in place by, or soon after, the middle of the thirteenth century.³²

This does not mean, however, that all the reliefs were made at that time. Nor must we assume that the order of the present arrangement—from left to right or from right to left—corresponds to the order of their creation. As regards their subject matter, the reliefs form three symmetrically arranged pairs: two Heracles figures (with sculptured frames) on the outside, the Virgin and the Archangel (with gray marble borders), and, in the middle, on either side of the central porch, the two warrior saints, George and Demetrius (with verd antique borders). Thus, the six reliefs are not to be "read" as a sequence in one direction, but to be viewed simultaneously.

The first relief, next to the left (north) corner of the façade, is one of the most interesting sculptures in the orbit of San Marco.³³ It represents Heracles with the Erymanthian boar (fig. 38) on his shoulders, striding forward towards the right; the frightened Eurystheus, represented in diminished size, hides in a pithos. The main figure with its load, and the subsidiary figure fill the rectangle without being squeezed in by the frame. The heroic pose of Heracles is fully developed although the movement is treated two-dimensionally. The figure is sharply outlined against the smooth ground but the relief within the contours is modeled organically, in soft gradations. Legs and arms are fully rounded, while torso and head are flattened so as not to protrude beyond the imaginary front plane. Everything is arranged to form a majestic design; the scale of the details is perfectly adjusted to that of the principal forms, and nothing is allowed to detract from the clarity of the whole. This cannot, however, be called an independent and self-contained composition; it is rather an adaptation to a rectangular frame of a motif borrowed from statuary.

³² Martino Da Canale, *Chronique*, p. 290. For the entire question of the six façade icons, see O. Demus, "Die Reliefikonen." There is no basis whatsoever for the assumption of F. Kieslinger, "Le transenne," that the six façade reliefs, like the evangelists of the north façade (see *infra*) were originally part of the sculptural decoration of the templon or iconostasis. Apart from the fact that the reliefs are indicated in the mosaic representation of the façade, above the Porta Sant'Alipio, this would be impossible for reasons of format and of iconography. Kieslinger, in fact, found it necessary to rechristen Heracles and call him Samson.

³³ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 130f. (*ibid.*, note 4, a resumé of earlier opinions on the relief): *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 59f. A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 519f. (with parallels from Greek vase painting); R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 287, seems to regard the relief as Venetian, thirteenth century; S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 27, describes it erroneously as "l'eroe che porta le spoglie del leone Nemeo e le presenta ad Euristeo" and considers it as a (Venetian?) copy after a Byzantine ivory relief. A mediaeval date was also assumed by R. v. Schneider, "Über das Kairos-relief," p. 282f. and H. Graeven, "Ein Reliquienkästchen." A critical analysis of the relief is still lacking. A later Byzantine replica in the Byzantine Museum of Athens, A. Xyngopoulos, *Βυζαντινὸν ἀνάγλυφον*, p. 1 ff.; for Venetian repetitions see O. Wulff, *Mittelalterliche Bildwerke*, no. 1760, p. 29.

As a matter of fact, this statuesque motif can be traced back to the sixth century B.C.³⁴ It occurs on archaic vases and in two bronze appliqués from Delphi; later it seems to have formed part of Lysippus' cycle of the "Labors of Heracles," which were taken from Alyzia to Rome, where they exerted a great influence. The original bronze groups were translated into marble reliefs and used for the decoration of Roman sarcophagi, where we find the scene with the Erymanthian boar in a composition that is almost identical with that on the San Marco relief. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the Venetian relief is considerably later than the third century sarcophagi. The movement of the main figure has lost its organic innervation, the modelling is flatter, and the manner in which the component parts of the relief are closely fitted into the frame, is decidedly mediaeval. The closest stylistic parallel is, perhaps, a relief in the National Museum of Ravenna which represents another scene from the Heracleian cycle: the hero capturing the Keryneian hind.³⁵ The composition of this relief conforms to an almost fixed iconographic pattern which remained constant from one of the metopes of the Temple of Zeus in Olympia to the Alyzian cycle of Lysippus, and down to late Roman times, in reliefs as well as in groups of statuary. The Ravenna relief, which has not yet been properly studied, is usually dated in the sixth century. In spite of the relationship between it and the Venetian relief, the two cannot have belonged to the same cycle of "Labors." There are discrepancies in scale, in the types, in the material, and even in the style, which make it doubtful that the two works could be ascribed to the same period. The Venetian relief is more classical in type, modeling, and composition; a classical taste of this kind was flourishing in the beginning of the fifth century and, much later, in the tenth century in Byzantium, while it was foreign to the sixth century.

In any case, the relief is an incongruity in the thirteenth-century façade of San Marco. It must have come to Venice from outside—whether from Constantinople, or from Ravenna, or else from one of the late antique towns of the Adriatic shore (Heraclea?), we shall never know. In Venice it was certainly regarded as "antique" and consequently framed with dentils and a classical molding. The two Romanesque lions below the relief belong to an entirely different world and were inserted as space-fillers.

The corresponding relief at the south end of the west façade representing Heracles with the Keryneian hind and the Lernean hydra (fig. 39) is entirely different.³⁶ The discrepancy between the two Heracles reliefs is the more marked as the second is clearly inspired by the first—it is, in fact, nothing but a paraphrase of it. The entire composition is borrowed from the first relief, par-

³⁴ F. Brommer, *Herakles*, p. 18 ff. See esp. pls. 1, 2, 12, 31; a list of vase paintings on p. 83 ff.; E. Loeffler, "Lysippos' Labors," with list of sarcophagi and bibliography.

³⁵ Catalogue of the Museo Nazionale, Ravenna, by G. Bovini, no. 36. A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, fig. 366. H. Peirce and R. Tyler, *L'art*, I, pl. 10 and p. 37, suggesting a fourth-century date. Most authors regard it as a sixth-century work. Bibliography in *Trésors d'art du moyen âge en Italie* (Paris, 1952) no. 7. On the early prototypes of the composition (Olympia, Theseion, Palermo) see E. Loeffler, "Lysippos' Labors," p. 10 f.

³⁶ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 131; A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 521 f.; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 287.

ticularly the stance of Heracles, the forceful stride, the way in which he carries the animal, and even the motif which fills the right bottom corner. Instead of Eurystheus, the artist has placed here a dragon, the hydra, so that the relief actually illustrates two of the hero's labors. It is quite clear from the form in which these two scenes are represented that the artist had never seen a classical rendering of the one or the other. The dominant, and virtually the only, classical iconography of the capture of the Keryneian hind shows the hero placing his knee upon the animal's back and holding its antlers with both hands.³⁷ The scene was rendered in this way from the fifth century B.C. (Olympia) to the fifth century A.D. (Ravenna). In Greek and Roman representations of the struggle with the Lernean hydra, Heracles grabs the monster with one hand and raises his club with the other. The artist of the Venetian relief followed neither the one nor the other; he simply copied for the first scene the composition of the boar relief and added the hydra as a kind of attribute. The device is purely conceptual and can be found again in the Bâle Cameo of Heracles with the lion and the hydra which has been attributed to the twelfth or the thirteenth century.³⁸ Although the second Heracles relief is thus a paraphrase of the first, it forms the strongest possible contrast to the almost classical simplicity of its prototype. While the Venetian artist followed its composition in almost everything, he seems not so much to have misunderstood his model as to have aimed at something essentially different. The figure of Heracles lacks the impetus of the forceful stride, and the convincing reality of the prototype. The muscles of the thorax have been transformed into a linear pattern of parallel curves with a complete lack of understanding of organic form. The artist was more interested in the restless play of zigzagging lines, in the spiky pattern of the contours, than in the organic gradation of modelling. The most obvious change is in the drapery. Instead of the simple, parallel creases of the lion's hide in the model, he used a complicated arrangement of fluttering folds. The gnome-like, farouche figure is wedged into its frame and, indeed, transcends it; the linear movement spills over. The frame is dissimilar too. The dentils are smaller and more widely spaced, and the molding has been omitted. To compensate for this and to make the relief appear larger than it actually is, the panel was surrounded on three sides by strips of verd antique, while the fourth side was framed with an elaborate piece of decorative sculpture.

The same relationship that we have observed between the first and the sixth relief also exists between the third and the fourth, representing Sts. George and Demetrius respectively. St. Demetrius³⁹ is depicted as a warrior clad in "antique" military costume (fig. 40). He is seated on a folding chair and grips with his right hand his sword, withdrawing it from, or replacing it in the scabbard which is laid across his knees. This movement is echoed by the whole body. Everything,

³⁷ On the "normal" type, see E. Loeffler, "Lysippos' Labors," p. 10f., and F. Brommer, *Herakles*, pls. 1, 2, etc.

³⁸ J. Deér, "Die Baseler Löwenkamee," p. 133, pl. 48/17.

³⁹ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 141 (with earlier bibliography); A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 528ff. L. Bréhier, "Etudes," p. 93, regarded the relief and its counterpart as South-Italian works of the eleventh century.

from the slightly inclined head to the obliquely placed feet, participates in a rhythmic "contraposto" which makes the seated figure appear active and its attitude transitory. A combination of monumental restfulness and dramatic action is thus achieved. The Warrior Saint seems to watch an enemy. He is ready to spring to action. This is the theme which has determined the composition. There is a combination of solidity and movement. The legs of the folding chair are firmly wedged into the frame, forming a solid base, and, at the same time, a regular, even rigid pattern. The slanting lines of the figure, on the other hand, supply an element of movement. Sword and scabbard are parallel with the line connecting the knees and with the lower rim of the cloak. The details of the costume are simple and organic. There is no suggestion of linear enrichment or complication. The modelling of the relief is rounded, and gives the body an appearance of firmness without, however, making it heavy. There is a suggestion of three-dimensional space in the projection of the figure; the "background" seems to recede in depth. A simple frame with a curved profile, over which the chair and the sword protrude, contributes to the spatial effect of the icon.

The relief is damaged in its most sharply projecting parts, namely the head, shoulders, and knees. Of the face, only the part around the eyes is tolerably well preserved. The inscription is in Latin and reads SCS DIMITRIVS. Whether it has come down to us in its original form can hardly be stated with certainty. In any case, the relief itself must be regarded as the work of a Greek artist of the late twelfth century or even the beginning of the thirteenth century. It is almost certain that it came to Venice as part of the spoils from Constantinople. Had it been made in Venice by a Greek artist, it would have been logical for the superintendent of the decoration to commission the same artist to make both reliefs of warrior saints required for the façade, and not only one, leaving the other to be fashioned, in imitation of the first, by a Venetian craftsman. Furthermore, we find the iconographic type of this relief in Constantinople, Salonica, and the "colonial" regions of the Byzantine Empire. The description of a representation of St. George (the saint who corresponds to Demetrius) in a poem written by Manuel Philes at the beginning of the fourteenth century, must have referred to a work similar to this one.⁴⁰ The composition must have been widely disseminated, also in the form of painted icons. A Russian version of the thirteenth or early fourteenth century follows the same model as the Venetian relief. So far as the figure is concerned the two are identical in all particulars. Ours, however, is more "classical" in character and must, indeed, be regarded as an outstanding work of the refined court art of Byzantium. It is a replica of a famous prototype which was copied again and again.⁴¹

⁴⁰ The epigram "On the great Georgios seated in armour in front of the town, his sword half-drawn" is printed in E. Miller, *Manuelis Philae Carmina*, I, p. 119, no. CCXXVI; an Italian translation in A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 528. V. N. Lasareff, "Novyi pamyatnik," p. 186ff, esp. p. 200.

⁴¹ The painted icon (from Dimitrov) in the Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow, in V. N. Lasareff, *Istoriya*, Text, p. 143 ("late twelfth or early thirteenth century"), pl. 22of. Reliefs of the same type in Xeropotamou (H. Brockhaus, *Die Kunst*, pp. 49, 95, pl. 9), Leningrad (from Cherson; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 142, note 2), and Moscow (Russian Popular Art: [I. E. Grabar] *Istoriya*, I, p. 283).

The relief with the figure of St. George,⁴² the third from the left (fig. 41), corresponds to the icon of St. Demetrius on the other side of the main portal. Not only is it inspired by the latter, it might almost be called a copy, were it not for the fact that the stylistic "language" is profoundly different. The master of the St. George relief copied the composition of his model and the attitude of the figure, together with the folding chair and footstool. He did not even take the trouble to reverse the composition so as to produce a symmetrically corresponding counterpart. The imitation is exactly parallel to the treatment of the two Heracles figures. It may be argued that the repetition of a compositional scheme in the same "direction" is a specifically Venetian trait, and that Venetian art preferred this one-sided rhythm to symmetrical correspondence. In any case, the exact repetition made the copying easier.

The St. George is much nearer to the Demetrius than the second Heracles figure is to the first. After all, the subject matter is exactly the same, the only variation being the difference in name; and it must have been easier for the Venetian sculptor to approximate his model because this was much nearer to his time, being the work of an almost contemporary artist. Nevertheless, there are also profound differences between the two. The figure of St. George is much larger; it is crammed into the available space, touching the frame at the top, bottom, and left sides. The finely balanced ponderation of the prototype has disappeared. Although the angle of the feet is approximately copied from the Greek relief, the knees of St. George are placed horizontally in a line which forms a sharp angle with the oblique sword. The head is not inclined but slightly bent forward. The effect of this attitude is not one of quiet, elastic watchfulness, but of awkward heaviness; the threat of the sword is empty, despite the aggressive intensity of facial type and expression. The heaviness is further enhanced by the complicated drapery in which the lower part of the body is smothered: the seams of the cloak and the skirt form obtrusive zigzag patterns; zigzag lines appear also on the sleeves and the lower contours of the coat of mail, which, though copying the type of Demetrius' armour, is richer in detail. In spite of these and other realistic traits (e.g., the folds and creases of the stockings and leg wrappings), the figure seems less "real." The relief, though it is as high as in the model, gives the impression of flatness. It has no three-dimensional implications beyond its actual depth. Thus, the general effect of the relief is not plastic but linear, and discordantly so.

In spite of all this, it would be wrong to stress only the loss of elegance, functional logic, and three-dimensional organic form. The relief of St. George is not just a copy of its prototype, but its translation into an idiom which is still *in statu nascendi*. The development of this idiom—the artistic language of Venice—must have been a very rapid one. The relief of St. George is undoubtedly much more "advanced" in this respect than the Heracles. The

⁴² H. von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 141f. A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 528ff., curiously enough, regards the relief of St. George as a Byzantine original and that of St. Demetrius as a Venetian copy, because the latter is more "classical" in character and must, therefore, be Italian! There is no reason for dating the inscription in the fourteenth century, as Venturi does. A date that is a little too late (second half of the thirteenth century) is given by L. Planiscig, *Geschichte*, p. 41.

details, especially, show a growing feeling for realistic surface treatment (witness, for example, the creases of the trousers and the sleeves) which is still lacking in the Heracles. In addition, the St. George relief is much more "normal," less monstrous, as regards its general effect.

It is, in fact, because of, not in spite of these differences that the two reliefs must be ascribed to one master. They show two stages of a logical and individual development. The details, especially the physiognomic ones, leave no doubt about the common authorship. Nose, mouth, hair (rendered in double parallel curves), and hands are identical. Nor can it be questioned that the figure of St. George was made later than that of Heracles.

The fifth relief of the west façade, a figure of the Virgin in the attitude of an orant,⁴³ is the most mature of the Venetian "icons" of this series (fig. 43). In this instance, the relief that forms its counterpart on the façade, that of the archangel Gabriel, could not have served as a model. The Virgin is based on a Byzantine original which must have been available in Venice in the thirteenth century, though it has long since disappeared. The model must have been of the type of the very fine relief from the Mangana Monastery⁴⁴ in the Istanbul Museum; a fairly good replica of the same type is preserved in Sta Maria in Porto, Ravenna;⁴⁵ and another, weaker one, which is disfigured by gilding, is to be found in San Marco itself;⁴⁶ this is the "Madonna della Grazia" venerated to this day in the north aisle. The last mentioned relief differs from the icon of the façade in the attitude of the figure and in its less detailed execution. The more sophisticated surface treatment of the façade relief is, however, not only due to the fact that it is based on a better model—indeed, a model of very high quality must be assumed—but also to the particular aims of the artist. These aims were not those of a Byzantine sculptor. The complicated linear structure of the figure with its undulating and zigzagging seams, the sensitive modelling of folds and creases which, in spite of their exaggerated linearism, indicate the forms of the body which they cover, all this is certainly not Byzantine in character. Here there is none of that mathematical precision which is one of the chief qualities of mid-Byzantine design, none of its refined simplicity. The master has followed his bent towards agitated linearism, without, however, doing violence to the established pattern of the Byzantine model.

Perhaps the most pronounced difference between the Venetian relief and comparable Byzantine icons of the Madonna is to be found in the attitude and the expression of the head. In the Venetian relief the head is raised in a compelling, almost challenging manner, which is in profound contrast to the quiet, "neutral" attitude of pure "being" exhibited in similar Byzantine figures.

A close comparison between the Madonna, on the one hand, and the Heracles and the St. George, on the other, leads to the conclusion that the icon of the Orant is by the same master as the two other reliefs. It is the most successful

⁴³ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 132. The relief is somewhat restored, especially the head.

⁴⁴ See *supra*, note 25.

⁴⁵ See *supra*, note 21.

⁴⁶ See *supra*, p. 123f.

of the three, the first completely adequate "copy," or rather adaptation and translation of a Greek model into the language of Venetian art, the result of a rapid process of amalgamation. In the last resort, however, the relief of the Virgin, successful as a "copy," is just as "anti-Byzantine" as the Heracles with the hind; that it lacks the violence of the latter, is due to its being a later and, therefore, more mature work. It will be seen later that it was by no means the final work of the gifted master.

The last relief of the series has already been mentioned as the counterpart of the Madonna; it shows the Archangel Gabriel (fig. 42), standing on a footstool, clad in short tunic and open cloak, with long sceptre and orb in his hands.⁴⁷ From the suppedaneum rises a sheaf of lobed leaves. The relief has, like the Orant, no frame but only a border of grey marble. The state of preservation is bad; the face especially has suffered. However, there is enough left to show that the sculpture was of very good quality and that it is certainly a work of the thirteenth century. In some respects it resembles the relief of St. Demetrius with its plastically protuberant details. On the other hand, it contains some Gothic traits, such as the acanthus background, the pointed shoes, and the correct perspective of the suppedaneum, thus presenting a curious mixture of characteristics which make an accurate dating difficult. It may have been made in Venice by a sculptor who was conversant with the late Comnenian style, but, at the same time, receptive to new Gothic motifs and forms.

Thus, we have, on the west façade of San Marco, four Venetian and two imported Greek reliefs of which the latter were spoils while the former were made expressly for their location so as to form three pairs. The character of the pairs, and thus of the entire sequence, was determined by chance: among the Constantinopolitan spoils there were two reliefs of suitable size and content. For these two reliefs (Heracles and the Warrior Saint) companion pieces were produced by approximate duplication. If such a duplication had been effected as regards the third pair as well, we might be inclined to think that nothing more was intended than to adorn the façade with three pairs of decorative reliefs, the content of which was not regarded as being of great importance. By repeating the figure of Gabriel, it would have been easy to create a pair of Archangels, Gabriel and Michael. Instead of Michael, however, the Orant Virgin was chosen.

There must have been a very good reason for this anomaly, and the most logical explanation is that the decor of the façade was dictated by a well-defined program. This could have been so even if the program was suggested and, in part, conditioned, by the fortuitous existence of suitable spoils. But once conceived, the program was carried out consistently. The figure of the Maria Orans furnishes the key to the meaning of this program. We know from a description by Photius that the Orant Virgin was depicted in mosaic in the apse of the Church of the Pharos, "lifting up her pure arms on our behalf to

⁴⁷ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 140. The relief, which has suffered from weathering, is somewhat enigmatic. In my paper "Die Reliefikonen," p. 100, I assumed Greek provenance. The doubts which Professor S. Der Nersessian expressed to me about this made me change my mind, without, however, enabling me to classify the relief to my own satisfaction.

obtain well-being for the emperor and victory over his foes."⁴⁸ It is clear from this, that the Orant Virgin (or her icon) was regarded as the special protectress of the ruler or of the state. This is exactly the function of the Virgin on the façade of San Marco—and not of the Virgin only. All the other figures are "protectors" as well.

This is quite clear with regard to the Orant's counterpart, the figure of Gabriel. In the West as in Byzantium, the Archangel played the part of the ruler's protector.⁴⁹ It is true that, as a rule, Michael was cast for this role and not Gabriel. The explanation of this substitution may be found in the curious ambiguity, which is frequently found in Venetian programs. In isolated representations the Archangel was meant to be, and was regarded as the protector of ruler and state; when, however, he was seen together with the Virgin (who did not carry a child in her arms), he received, by association, the role of the Angel of the Annunciation. This implication, which was recognized by the Venetians whenever the Virgin and an archangel were juxtaposed, is the simplest explanation of the fact that the angel of San Marco is called Gabriel. It does not seem to have disturbed them that neither the angel nor the Virgin had anything to do in type, attitude, or costume with the persons of the Annunciation. Traditionally, the heavenly messenger always wears in this scene an antique garment and the "Annunciata" is never represented as an orant. But in Venice, where iconographic rules were loosened by arbitrary eclecticism, such an ambiguity was quite possible, especially as the position of the figures at the sides of gaping arches was reminiscent of their normal places to the left and right of the triumphal arch.⁵⁰

The case of the two Warrior Saints is relatively simple. St. Demetrius was the most popular and the most frequently represented of the protector saints of Byzantium. Originally linked with the local legend of Sàlonica, he became in the course of time one of the most widely venerated saints of the whole Empire, the holy protector of the state *par excellence*. From the seventh century, at the latest, he was frequently represented seated or even enthroned;⁵¹ quite possibly the cult of St. Demetrius played an important part in the genesis of the representation of martyrs enthroned "in majesty."⁵² In this, as in other particulars, St. George followed the lead of St. Demetrius. In the present example, the folding chair, the prerogative of the military leader, was surely meant as an attribute of the "Strategos." In an epigram Manuel Philes described St. George not as enthroned, but as having just resumed his seat after the rout of the enemy. Watchfully he eyes the foe, holding the half-bared sword across his knees, ready to spring to action at any moment. Demetrius and George were, for Venice as well as for Byzantium, a pair of Dioscuri, of heavenly twins.

⁴⁸ J. P. Richter, *Quellen*, p. 357. R. J. H. Jenkins and C. A. Mango, "The Date."

⁴⁹ See also the Patrocinia of the Archangels in western church architecture. See *supra*, History, note 183.

⁵⁰ O. Demus, *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration*, p. 23.

⁵¹ Ch. Diehl, M. Le Tourneau, H. Saladin, *Les monuments*, p. 99; A. Grabar, "Quelques reliquaires"; A. A. Vasiliev, "The Historical Significance."

⁵² A. Grabar, "Le trône."

Having found a relief of St. Demetrius in the booty from Constantinople, the Venetians would, almost as a matter of course, link the Warrior Saint with their own protector, St. George, who was from early times one of the chief patron saints of the city. Venice possessed valuable relics of St. George and the monastery of San Giorgio (Maggiore), a foundation of the tenth century, was for some time the sepulchral church of the doges. In any case, St. George was nearer to the hearts of the Venetians than would have been another holy "strategos," namely, Theodore, although (or even because) the latter had been the first patron of the Rialto dogate. As was shown above, Theodore had symbolized the dependence of Venice on the Byzantine Empire and the secession of Venice from Byzantium had led to his almost total eclipse. A representation of the former tutelary Saint would have been out of place on the façade of the doges' church in the thirteenth century especially—so soon after the destruction of the Byzantine state by a Venetian-led Crusade.⁵³

Demetrius and George were, then, important tutelary saints, holy protectors of the doge and the state. The two Venetian reliefs (and other representations of seated military saints) have thus been rightly classed as "apotropaic" representations.⁵⁴ This is, in fact, the meaning of all six reliefs. Reduced to its most concise formula the whole program is apotropaic. The two representations of Heracles, too, fit in with this idea. From late antiquity, Heracles was regarded as a tutelary hero, with the predicates of "victor," "invictus," and "antepor-tanus." In this quality he was represented on coins of Nero, Trajan, and Postumus. Emperors like Commodus, Gallienus, and Diocletian had themselves portrayed in the guise of the hero.⁵⁵ The reinterpretation of Heracles and his labors, and their transposition from the physical into the ethical sphere was also begun in the late antique period. In the Middle Ages, authors like Theodulf of Orleans went so far as to make Heracles a personification of "virtus" in the ethical sense. This allegoric interpretation was still upheld by Erasmus and, after him, by baroque humanism.⁵⁶ In the arts Heracles was frequently represented in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, not only in the humanistic programs of protorenaissance Tuscany, but also in the thoroughly "mediaeval" sculptures of the Emilia, on the façades of Modena, Parma, and Borgo San Donnino.⁵⁷

In these and other monuments Heracles was introduced as a parallel to, or as a substitute for, Samson. In some reliefs showing the fight with the lion it is even doubtful which of the two is meant.⁵⁸ In some programs of the fourteenth

⁵³ See *supra* History, p. 19 ff.

⁵⁴ This has already been realized by A. Grabar, "Le trône," p. 32. A similar function is fulfilled by the equestrian saints on church doors, etc., e.g. those of Bari, Trani, and Monreale; on the role of warrior saints in general, cf. E. Kantorowicz, "Ivories"; E. Lucius, *Les origines*, p. 272 ff.; V. N. Lasareff, "Novyi pamyatnik."

⁵⁵ J. Kroll, "Gott und Hölle," p. 399 ff.; A. Sambon, "L'Hercule," p. 30 ff.; J. Bayet, *Les origines*, pp. 333, 358, 377 ff., 381 ff., 388 ff.; M. Simon, *Hercule*, esp. pp. 119 ff., 169 ff. with bibliography.

⁵⁶ A. Frey-Sallmann, *Aus dem Nachleben*, pp. 27, 36; J. Seznec, "La survivance," pp. 23, 81, 133, 142; on Heracles in Byzantium see Weitzmann, "Das Evangelion," p. 88 ff.; *id.*, *Greek Mythology*, p. 157.

⁵⁷ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Die kirchliche Kunst*, pp. 232, 255; P. d'Ancona, *L'uomo*, p. 142 f.; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, pp. 157 ff., 250, 252 ff., 265, 287, etc.; G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, p. 364, note 137.

⁵⁸ J. Adhémar, "Influences," p. 221 ff. who quotes a book title of the tenth century, in the library of Lorsch: *De duodecim virtutibus Herculis et de Samsone fortissimo*.

century Heracles, vanquishing Geryones, is equated with the dragon-slayer George.⁵⁹ How far the mediaeval Christian interpretation had prevailed in thirteenth-century Venice, can hardly be ascertained in view of the almost complete lack of statements on spiritual or even religious matters, a lack that is characteristic of Venice in almost every age. Thus, it is hardly possible to say whether Saxl and Panofsky were right in believing that the Venetian representation of the hero trampling the hydra under foot and carrying the stag on his shoulders was meant to signify "the Saviour conquering evil and saving the souls of the faithful," that is, a specific allegory of Salvation.⁶⁰

In any case, the inclusion of Heracles in the series of tutelary saints and protectors was certainly no anomaly in thirteenth-century Venice. The use which the Venetians made of the relief with the boar, which chance had brought to their town, was, therefore, quite legitimate. The figure of Heracles and its meaning must have been known to them. To point to one possible source only: members of the workshop which was responsible for the façade sculptures of Borgo San Donnino, where there is a representation of Heracles, also worked on the façade of San Marco.⁶¹ To every Venetian the name of Heracles must have been familiar, because of the city of Eraclea—Heracliana, the earliest political center of the lagoons and seat of the first dogate. It is not improbable that the inclusion of Heracles among the protectors of the city was very welcome to the protohumanists of the thirteenth century, not only because the name of the hero was reminiscent of the oldest ducal town, but also because he was believed to have been the original tribal hero of the Veneti.⁶²

The order in which the six protectors are arranged on the façade of San Marco is not the one that might be expected from the point of view of dignity or rank of the members of the series: the Virgin and the Archangel would normally be placed in a central position, whereas here the center is occupied by the two Warrior Saints. It is unlikely that this arrangement was dictated exclusively by formal considerations, such as the wish to bring about a gradation from figures in violent action, to quietly standing ones and finally to seated figures in complete repose—especially as the posture of the seated Warrior Saints is not one of complete rest. The central position of the latter seems, however, quite in keeping with the character of San Marco as the Venetian state church: even the Virgin and the Archangel had to cede pride of place to the two Warriors. Of course, considering the rather blurred contours of Venetian programs, all six figures can be interpreted with equal justification as protectors of the state and as saviors of souls. The latter is true even of Saints George and Demetrius, who, as Manuel Philes says expressly in his poem, warded off "the enemy of our souls."⁶³

⁵⁹ A. Frey-Sallmann, *Aus dem Nachleben*, p. 36.

⁶⁰ E. Panofsky and F. Saxl, "Classical Mythology," p. 288 ff.

⁶¹ The relief of Borgo San Donnino bears the inscription *fortis Hercules*. G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, II, fig. 414.

⁶² J. Bayet, *Les origines*, pp. 70 f., 169.

⁶³ E. Miller, *Manuelis Philae carmina*, I, p. 119: τὸν ἁγθὸν τῶν ψυχῶν. The fact that all six figures are "holy protectors" was recognized by A. Vardanega, who also stressed the homogeneity of the program of the façade sculptures ("Nella Basilica," p. 107 ff.).

Three of the six reliefs are probably, as I have said, works of one master. The sequence, judging from their stylistic development, was the following: Heracles with the hind, St. George, and finally the Virgin. This order corresponds to the sequence of the three reliefs from right (south end of the façade) to left; it also agrees with what we know about the general progress of the work on the main façade. The same direction can be established as regards the work on the mosaics in the interior of the atrium and in the tympana of the façade. Even though the latter have been lost, with the exception of the one above the Porta Sant'Alipio, they can be reconstructed from Gentile Bellini's procession panel. It is clear that work on these mosaics progressed in the logical order of the story they tell, the *Translatio* of the relics. In the same logical way, the sculptor began with the Heracles and ended with the Virgin. The stylistic difference between the Heracles relief and that of St. George seems to be greater than that between the latter and the Orant Virgin. This may be due to the fact that in the progress of incrustation and sculptural decoration from right to left, there must have been a considerable time-lag between the first (Heracles) and the fourth (George) relief, while the latter was followed immediately by the Orant Virgin.

The Heracles relief (fig. 39) was, in any case, the starting point of a particular style which assumed great importance for the development of Venetian sculpture in general. A study of the ingredients of this nascent style is, therefore, of considerable importance. It is, first, a style not of sculpture in the round but of flat relief. The composition aims at producing a richly variegated surface with hardly any plastic or spatial implications. This is certainly a practical application of a lesson that the Venetian sculptor learned from Byzantine reliefs. An element, however, which could not have come from Byzantine sculpture—at least in the overemphatic form in which the master of the Heracles uses it—is the agitated linearism. It is true that towards the end of the Comnenian period Byzantine art, too, had affected a more and more complicated and restless linear style, and this tendency seems to have become intensified in the early thirteenth century. But in no instance do we find contours which consist of nothing but zigzags and undulations, as is the case in the Heracles relief. The relief is, in this respect, nearer to certain productions of late Romanesque art—and specifically to the "Zackenstil" of paintings done in Germany and the Alpine region—than to any Byzantine style. The reliefs of the Bamberg screen are closer parallels than contemporary Byzantine or Italian works. It is, of course, unlikely that the Venetian sculptor ever went to Germany or ever saw a German sculpture; but he certainly knew the mosaics of San Marco which were made at that time and which clearly show the influence of late Romanesque linearism.⁶⁴ The contact between Venetian and nordic art was in all probability brought about by illuminated books which somehow reached Italy and influenced, in the first instance, Italian illumination; so, for example, the productions of the so-called Gaibana workshop of Padua-Venice.⁶⁵ Such imports

⁶⁴ See O. Demus, "Über einige venezianische Mosaiken," p. 87 ff.

⁶⁵ I. Hänsel, "Die Miniaturmalerei," with bibliography.

need not have been numerous; a few works in "strategic positions" could and must have exerted considerable influence. At least one of these books should be mentioned here: the Psalter of Saint Elizabeth, an early but important product of the so-called "Saxon-Thuringian" school, which was brought to Aquileia as early as the twenties of the thirteenth century.⁶⁶

The Heracles relief may have been made about 1230; it certainly originated within the second quarter of the thirteenth century. How long an interval separates this from the St. George panel, it is not easy to say: it may have been as much as a decade. The artist certainly grew in stature in the meantime. He acquired a new understanding of organic movement, a new feeling for surface differentiation and, on the whole, a more natural attitude. The figure of St. George, clumsy as it is compared to its Byzantine model, is far removed from the farouche, gnome-like Heracles. On the other hand, the artist retained certain characteristics that were already fully developed in the first relief; the later work shares with the earlier certain physiognomic traits, like the broad, somewhat flattened nose, and technical idiosyncrasies, like the rendering of the hair by means of double lines. It also retains something of that spiky, restless quality and truculent expression. In the relief of the Orant Virgin these qualities have been considerably smoothed down, but they are still there, in the lines no less than in the attitude of the figure. But the zigzagging line has lost most of its expressive quality, and has gained, instead, in decorative elegance. This decorative character, this elegance of composition and line is, indeed, the most important element to have grown out of the interplay of Byzantine and late Romanesque tendencies on Venetian soil. It is, in fact, the new ingredient which the Venetians added to the "imported" qualities, an ingredient which, to a large extent, was to shape the development of relief sculpture in Venice.

B. RELIEFS FROM THE ICONOSTASIS AND SIDE ALTARS. The closest parallels to the style of the façade "icons" are five reliefs, now set into the wall of the north façade next to the Porta dei Fiori. They represent Christ and the four evangelists (figs. 44-47), the first enthroned in a frontal position, blessing with His right and holding the Book with His left; the latter seated on elaborate benches, in three-quarter views, two facing left and two right, all in the attitude of writing. St. John is accompanied by a female figure (fig. 7), probably developed from the Prochoros of Byzantine prototypes and, surely, reinterpreted as Sophia or Inspiration. All are well preserved on the whole, except for a drastic cleaning in the nineteenth century which robbed them of their original surface. Their present position is certainly not the original one; according to the late Dr. Kieslinger's convincing hypothesis, they were part of the thirteenth-century iconostasis of San Marco which was replaced in the last years of the fourteenth century by the Massegne screen.⁶⁷ Dr. Kieslinger, who included a number of other reliefs in his reconstruction of the sculptural decor of the former iconostasis, was of the opinion that this iconostasis was erected in the course of the adapta-

⁶⁶ See K. Löffler, *Der Landgrafenpsalter*, p. 5.

⁶⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 271 ff.; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 141; A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 538; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 39; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 791; O. Demus, "Zwei marmorne Altariken"; A. Kieslinger, "Le transenne."

tions which became necessary as a result of the fire of 1231. There is no proof of any such connection, but the date, the second quarter of the thirteenth century, is probably correct. We can also follow Dr. Kieslinger in assuming that the five reliefs belonged to the front of the screen, with the smaller panel of Christ above the "royal door" and the evangelists on either side. Quite possibly the angel in armor (Michael?) the original of which was replaced in the nineteenth century by a replica now situated on the left side of the Manin monument, and St. George, at the extreme right of the north façade, were also part of the screen, decorating the north and south wings respectively.⁶⁸ They are counterparts but, as is the rule in Venice, not symmetrically reversed in movement and attitude. Whether other sculptures which now adorn the façade of San Marco also belonged to the dismantled screen, as Kieslinger believed, is, at most, very doubtful. Certainly the icons of the west façade never formed part of the screen. As was shown above, they were already in their present position in the sixties of the thirteenth century.

The seven reliefs which can be attributed to the former iconostasis with some degree of certainty are not all by the hand of one artist. They form two clearly distinguishable groups which, however, are connected with each other by so many ties that they must both be ascribed to one common workshop.⁶⁹ To the master of the workshop must be attributed the figures of Christ, Luke, Matthew, and John (figs. 44-46, 7), while Mark (fig. 47) and George are the work of an inferior hand. Whether the angel in warrior's costume was by the hand of either of the two cannot be determined since the original has not survived.

The first artist, to whom the larger group of reliefs is due, was none other than the Heracles Master. This is so evident that it needs no elaborate proof. It is only necessary to compare the head of Heracles (fig. 39) with the heads of Luke and Matthew (figs. 45, 46) in order to realize that we are confronted by works of the same hand: we find in all three instances the same piercing glance of the eyes, the same nose with broad nostrils, the same mouth and moustache, and an identical way of treating hair and beard. True, the reliefs of the evangelists are more smoothly finished and somewhat more quiet in their tenor, but this is due to their being somewhat later and more mature works of the artist. The pattern of the undulating folds of the evangelists' garments is less agitated than that of Heracles' drapery; the artist has, furthermore, gained a deeper understanding of organic movement and plastic projection. His treatment of the surfaces is masterly and goes beyond the possibilities of Byzantine relief sculpture. The artist's models were, in all likelihood, not reliefs, but Byzantine paintings or model-book drawings. The San Marco reliefs share with Byzantine paintings of the evangelists their oblique position, the attitudes of the figures, and certain typical movements and motifs. They do not conform, on the other hand, to the physiognomic canons established in Byzantium for the representation of the evangelists, nor have they anything in common with the mosaic figures in the pendentives of the central cupola of San Marco.

⁶⁸ On these reliefs see H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 140ff. with bibliography.

⁶⁹ L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 39ff. has already divided the five reliefs into two groups, but attributed one group to the beginning, the other to the end of the thirteenth century.

The figure of Mark (fig. 47)⁷⁰ differs from the others by a more summary technique; by a certain clumsiness, especially noticeable in the hands; by misunderstandings, such as the shape of the book; and finally, by some intentional deviations in details, as, for instance, in those of the bench. Otherwise, the figure is an almost slavish copy of Matthew, a fact which characterizes the author of the Mark relief as an apprentice of the Heracles master. To the same hand must be ascribed the standing figure of St. George with drawn sword and oval shield, which forms part of the decoration of the north façade. In spite of the difference in the attributes, the figure is a free copy of the Gabriel of the west façade (fig. 42). Cloak and tunic are arranged in identical folds. Other details, such as leggings, cuirass, etc., are derived from the relief of the seated St. George on the west façade. Other works by this apprentice of the Heracles Master will be studied later.⁷¹

Another "displaced" relief, the mutilated inscription of which has given rise to widespread misconception as to its date, is found in close vicinity to the reliefs of the evangelists on the north façade. The panel with the frontal figure of St. Leonard (fig. 49)⁷² shows, on the lower part of its frame between the feet of the Saint, the remnants of an inscription, now consisting of the four letters CIVS. Most authors believe that this inscription originally read BERTV-CIVS, and identified the master with the Venetian goldsmith of that name who in 1300 signed and dated the second door from the left of the main façade of San Marco.⁷³ The relief has suffered both from weathering and from the hands of restorers. The stylistic traits are, however, preserved well enough to make so late a date extremely unlikely. It is equally unlikely that the name read "Bertucius." If the band on which the remnants of the inscription are preserved, began with the vertical contour of the cornice, it did not offer sufficient room for five more letters, or even four, assuming that two were combined in a ligature. The palaeographic character of the letters, too, points rather to the second quarter of the thirteenth century than to a date as advanced as 1300. Finally, there is no reason for assuming that the *aurifex* Bertucius created large-scale reliefs in stone. The relief is an icon in an even more specific sense than are the reliefs of the west façade. It was originally the "altar-panel" of the altar of St. Leonard in the south transept; that is, it was set into the wall behind the altar. We know that it was still in this place in 1345, the date of the back cover of the Pala d'oro,⁷⁴ in one of whose painted panels it is portrayed together with the altar itself. The relief was removed to the north façade, most probably when the altar was rededicated in 1618.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ O. Demus, "Zwei marmorne Altarikonnen," p. 99ff.

⁷¹ See *infra*, p. 144.

⁷² P. Selvatico, *Sulla architettura*, p. 85; C. Schnaase, *Geschichte*, VII, p. 258; *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 272; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 141; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 42; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 897; O. Demus, "Zwei marmorne Altarikonnen," p. 99f. and note 2. On a possibly affiliated work in Brevnov in Bohemia cf. J. Kvet, "Un reflet."

⁷³ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 403ff. A. Prosdocimi, "Le porte" (fig. 4).

⁷⁴ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, pl. XII. N. di Carpegna, "La 'coperta.'"

⁷⁵ The documents (G. Stringa, 1610 and G. Meschinello, 1753) are printed in *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, pp. 263, 291; see also *supra*, History, note 158.

In spite of the effects of weathering and the fact that the different character of the subject matter makes a comparison difficult, it can be said with certainty that the relief belongs to the orbit of the Heracles Master. Mouth, nose, hands, and especially the wavy hair and beard, are characteristic of his workshop.

The original companion piece of the St. Leonard panel is the former altar icon of St. John the Evangelist (fig. 48),⁷⁶ which has also found its place on the north façade. It may have been transferred there at the same time as was the St. Leonard, although it had been replaced by a fifteenth-century relief more than 150 years before the rededication to the Virgin of the altar of the north transept (St. John's altar). The relief shows the hand of the chief master's apprentice who also made the reliefs representing the Evangelist Mark and the standing St. George in armor. These three reliefs share among them the somewhat dull and heavy effect of the composition as a whole, the "viscous" character of the drapery, the clumsy hands and feet, and the gloomy expression of the faces. Compared with the productions of this provincial craftsman those of the Heracles Master assume a nervous brilliance and an unmistakable Venetian character.

C. THE SIDE PORTALS. The works in which the Venetian bent for elegance reached its highest development are the decorative reliefs that frame, and partly fill, the tympana of the side portals of the west façade (figs. 86 ff.).⁷⁷ Only two of them, however, are more or less in their original state, namely those of the Porta Sant'Alipio (figs. 88, 89) and of the Zeno chapel (fig. 86). The two others have been altered by the insertion, or rather the breaking through, of windows, an adaptation which may have been carried out at the time when the bronze doors of these portals were cast (about A.D. 1300) or even later, perhaps under Bartolomeo Gradenigo (1339-1342). The purpose of the alteration was certainly that of admitting more light into the atrium. How much of the original plastic decor of the tympana was destroyed on this occasion it is difficult to tell; but it is likely that, at the very least, there were arcades filled with ornamental motifs, as above the window of the Zeno chapel, and there may have been lintels with plastic decoration like the one still extant above the Porta Sant'Alipio.

No two of the porch decorations are or were alike, although the first and second from the right form one group and the fourth and fifth another. Generally speaking, there is a marked increase in decorative wealth from right to left—which is the direction in which work on the façade progressed. The first group (porches one and two, from the right, figs. 86, 87) is distinguished by half figures of angels, while in the second group (porches four and five, figs. 88-90) seated

⁷⁶ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, pp. 211, 271; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 141 f.; O. Demus, "Zwei marmorne Altarikonnen," p. 101 ff. The fifteenth-century relief which replaced the relief of St. John is reproduced in *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli V/6*, P. 4 (= pl. 280). A late follower of the Venetian "Pale" of St. Leonard and St. John is that of St. Lawrence in the Chapel of the Hospital of San Lorenzo in Venice (fifteenth century). The fifteenth-century relief of St. John is reproduced in *Arte veneta*, IX (1955), p. 53.

⁷⁷ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 165 ff.; A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 534 f.; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 802; O. Demus, "Die Reliefigkonnen," pp. 91, 98.

prophets (a characteristic motif of Ducento sculpture) are fitted into the spandrels of the frame. On the other hand, the ogee arches of the first and fifth portals are framed with acanthus motifs, whereas the round arches of the second and fourth porches are studded with projecting globular bosses. Thus, a certain symmetry is preserved, which shows that, although this work must have taken considerable time, there existed an over-all plan for the decoration of the doors by one workshop, and that this plan was not abandoned in the course of the work. The chief elements, technical and formal, of which the decoration is composed also remained constant during this time. The framing decor of all four tympana consists of a combination of relief sculpture and gold mosaic, the relief ground being covered with, or supplanted by, the mosaic. The resulting impression is of a perforated decor, of a network of dark ornamentation on lucid ground, one might almost say of embroidery on gold brocade, as in some works of the Cosmati. The motifs, aside from figures, are tendrils, acanthus leaves, and plastic bosses.

The tendrils are, perhaps, the most interesting single motif since they connect the façade decor with the mosaics of the interior of the atrium, and thus permit the establishment of relative dates. The first two porches from the right (figs. 86, 87) show spiral scrolls with "Sassanian palmettes" in the center and radial "stays" between the parallel courses of the spirals. The "flowers" of the "Sassanian palmettes" of the second porch are more elaborate than those of the first; otherwise, there is no appreciable difference between the tendrils of the first and the second doors. This type, with more or less regular spirals connected by short radial branches, can be exactly paralleled in the mosaics of the atrium, namely on the arch just inside the Porta Sant'Alipio, at the north end of the west wing of the atrium. In other words, this motif found its full development at a time when the first phase of the work on the mosaic decoration of the atrium was already nearing its end. The intertwined tendrils of the fourth doorway from the right (fig. 90) begin to occur in the same section of the mosaics; they appear once in the mosaic decoration of the north wing, but in a somewhat freer and more developed form. The wild acanthus tendrils of the last porch, that of Sant'Alipio (fig. 89), on the other hand, occur for the first time in the mosaics of the north wing.⁷⁸ The conclusion to be drawn from this with regard to dating the phases of the façade decoration, is that the sculptural decor of the first two doors was made before or about 1230, that of the fourth door after 1230, and that of the Porta Sant'Alipio after the middle of the century. There was, therefore, a considerable time-lag between the work on the major part of the façade decoration and that on the Porta Sant'Alipio. The second most prominent motif among the nonfigurative elements of the decoration of the portals is the semi-globular boss which, in some instances is, or gives the impression of being, in openwork. This motif seems to have originated in oriental decoration and then invaded Byzantium, where it lived on until the very end of Byzantine and post-Byzantine art. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries seem to

⁷⁸ S. Bettini, *Mosaici antichi*, pl. LXXXV ff.; on the dates of these motifs: O. Demus, *Die Mosaiken*, p. 48 ff.; *idem*, "The Ciborium Mosaics," p. 241.

have favored this motif to an especially high degree—witness the silver frames of icons of that period. From metalwork this motif spread to sculpture in wood and stone.⁷⁹ In San Marco itself there are several relief slabs, used for parapets in the galleries, partly imported from Byzantium, partly manufactured in Venice, which are decorated with this motif. But Venice was not the only place outside Byzantium to take up this Byzantine motif. It can also be found in south Italian sculpture of the thirteenth century,⁸⁰ which shared with Venice the same general scheme of figural reliefs in spandrels.

This type of semifigural, semi-ornamental decor, especially with half-figures of angels in the spandrels, seems to have originated in the thirteenth century as a synthesis of western and Byzantine motifs. The best examples, those from the Kariye Camii are, it is true, later than those in San Marco; but there are earlier ones, like the marble fragments from the church of Constantine Lips in Constantinople, the date of which is controversial, but cannot be later than the thirteenth century.⁸¹

All of the small half-length figures of angels in the frames of the first two tympana of San Marco share a very strong family likeness; if they belong to different artists, as the different way of treating the wings and the higher quality of the first angel might suggest, these artists must be regarded as members of a workshop which was dominated by a sculptor with a strongly defined personality. The same artist, in a somewhat later stage of his career, was responsible for the decoration of the two portals to the left of the main door. In the two latter instances the artist placed seated figures of prophets in the spandrels⁸² on either side of the arch, and in the apex of the arch a figure of Christ, as Pantocrator and Emanuel respectively. It is evident at first glance that these figures are by the hand of the Heracles Master. The head of the prophet at the left of the Sant'Alipio arch (fig. 89) is almost identical in form and features with the head of Heracles carrying the hind (fig. 39); even the turban-like hat is the same. Although the differences in type and execution are very small indeed, nevertheless, they show clearly that the decor of the Porta Sant'Alipio is later than the Heracles. The plastic treatment of the body, in soft gradations and organic modelling is linked to that of the evangelists of the former iconostasis (fig. 44 ff.); the undulating folds of the garments have something of the calligraphic re-

⁷⁹ Among the frames of mosaic icons, compare e.g. those of St. Anne at Vatopedi and St. Nicholas, Kiev, formerly in Vich; in stone carving openwork bosses occur most frequently in the Palaeologan period. For example, one finds them in the buildings of Mistra (Evangelistria) and in the Kariye Camii; but many pierced bosses are to be seen on middle-Byzantine transenna panels in San Marco. On these panels, which were in all likelihood the source from which the Venetian stone masons drew their inspiration, see H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 109 ff. The latest (Palaeologan) form of the perforated boss is the spiral acanthus rosette.

⁸⁰ E.g., in S. Nicola in Bari (west portal) and on the pulpit of Bitonto (1229, by Master Nicholas). Cf. W. Wackernagel, "Die Plastik"; E. Bertaux, *L'art*, etc.

⁸¹ The ciborium fragments from the church of Constantine Lips in the Archaeological Museum in Istanbul (Catalogue Mendel no. 75) are reproduced in S. Casson, "Byzantium," pl. I, A, p. 268, and D. T. Rice, *Byzantine Art*, pl. 26, a. b. The arch decorations in the Kariye Camii are reproduced in F. Schmit, *Kahrie*, pls. LXXXIII, LXXXIV, and LXXXVIII/2. See A. Xyngopoulos, *Φραγχοβουζαντινὰ γλυπτὰ*, and a forthcoming study by A. Grabar which makes it clear that the fragments from the church of Constantine Lips belong to the thirteenth century.

⁸² Examples of seated prophets in spandrels are given by H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 166, note 2.

gularity that distinguishes the linear pattern in the drapery of the Virgin Orans of the west façade (fig. 43).

The interval of time or the progress in the stylistic evolution of the workshop between the first and the last porch decorations of the west façade can best be gauged if we compare the tendrils and scrolls of the two works. In the first decoration (fig. 86) they are linear and flat; they have neither body nor organic life and movement. These qualities are, however, found in the acanthus scrolls of the last door, especially those that frame the ogee arch (figs. 88, 89). There the leaves are reminiscent of the "wind-blown" acanthus capitals of the fifth century and were probably inspired by them. They are braided together and twisted so as to frame miniature sculptures representing animals (birds, griffins, quadrupeds, fighting animals) or human figures (Virgin ?, putto). This decorative motif, the "inhabited" scroll, is common in book illumination and is of the greatest importance in the sculptural decoration of churches in Italy and the Balkans.⁸³ The same motif can be observed, as will be seen later on, in other Venetian works which antedate the Porta Sant'Alipio.

Four roundels and one small square relief which are set into the verd antique incrustation of the tympanum proper also belong to the decoration of this porch (figs. 88, 89). These reliefs representing St. George and the symbols of the four evangelists have been regarded as spoils, or as works originally belonging to other contexts and placed here at a later period.⁸⁴ This assumption was, apparently, based on the feeling that these reliefs had, in their present position, little *raison d'être* from the point of view of iconography and formal arrangement. Such a feeling would be justified in an *ambiente* with stricter iconographic and aesthetic standards; it has no justification with respect to Venice. This type of decoration, namely roundels of the evangelists' symbols set into a tympanum, actually does occur in Italian decoration—witness the tympanum of San Silvestro at Nonantola.⁸⁵ In addition, at least one of the roundels can be attributed to a Venetian artist of the period in which the portal was decorated: the Angel of Matthew is, without doubt, by the hand of the Heracles Master's assistant who made the altar icon of St. John the Evangelist (fig. 48), the seated image of St. Mark (fig. 47), and the standing figure of St. George, all now on the north façade. Although points of comparison would be difficult to establish, it is likely that the other three roundels are also by the same artist. On the other hand, the square relief of St. George seems to be an imported piece for which it would be difficult to find parallels anywhere.

The decoration of the Porta Sant'Alipio is the most mature achievement of the workshop on the west façade. It was not, however, its last work. There is one more piece of decorative sculpture on the west façade itself which, though more modest—and more difficult to see—is even richer and bolder in surface treatment and technique, namely, the decor of the "tabernacle"-arch which terminates the west façade at its northern end. Its subject is the Annunciation.

⁸³ E.g. in Ferrara, Modena, Pomposa, Bari in Italy, and in Dečani in Serbia (M. Pupin, *Dečani*, I, pls. XXIX, XLV, etc.). For central and southern Italy, see O. Lehmann-Brockhaus, "Die Kanzeln."

⁸⁴ F. Kieslinger, "Le transenne."

⁸⁵ M. G. Zimmermann, *Oberitalische Plastik*, p. 168 ff., fig. 54.

The drill, which was sparingly used in the Porta Sant'Alipio, has here become the most important instrument of the sculptor, who seems to have fallen once more under the dominating influence of Byzantine art. Four more portals, or, rather, decorations crowning doorways in San Marco are important works of the Heracles Master's *bodega*. They seem to represent different trends and stages in the development of this workshop. Three of these *sopraporte* have in common the "saracenic" shape of the arch; of the fourth, only the outer arch is preserved. The simplest and probably earliest of these decorations is the one which tops the door leading from the south transept into the Tesoro (fig. 92).⁸⁶ For this door we have a *terminus post quem*, provided by the burning of the old Tesoro in 1231.⁸⁷ Unfortunately, we have nothing even approaching a *terminus ante* or *ad quem*. The linear treatment of the tendrils in the arch and their arrangement in a single plane must not be taken as proof of an early date, that is, of a date immediately after the *terminus* of 1231. The linear scroll corresponds primarily to a certain "mode" and not to a certain phase in Venetian decorative sculpture. At any rate, the realistic animals in natural movement which fill the loops of the scrolls are not at all suggestive of an early phase of development. However, the date of the arch is certainly within the second quarter of the thirteenth century. The character of the relief is different from that of the animals in the decor of the Porta Sant'Alipio; it is more metallic and reminiscent of forms developed in the field of toreutic art.

A very similar "inhabited" scroll adorns the innermost arch of the Porta dei Fiori (fig. 91)⁸⁸ on the north façade. It must, however, have been made a little later, for something of the purity of form has been lost. The master's attention seems to have been focussed on the figure relief which fills the inner space of the tympanum. It is evident that this relief is also by the workshop of the Heracles Master, and probably by the Master of St. John's altar icon (fig. 48). The figure of Joseph repeats one of the prophets of the Porta Sant'Alipio (figs. 88, 89) in a different attitude. The relief is characteristically Venetian in its combination of purely decorative and representational qualities. From the point of view of later aesthetics, a viewpoint which naturally did not trouble the Venetians, the danger which threatened this art was an over-facile prettiness. This was especially imminent whenever this art departed from the sphere of pure decor and entered that of iconic representation. This danger was once more avoided in the second arch, which shows full-length figures of angels emerging from a fringe of acanthus leaves (fig. 91). The figures are akin to the angel of the Annunciation on the last arch of the west façade; the acanthus decor, on the other hand, combines the leafy design of the Porta Sant'Alipio with the bosses of the other side doors of the main façade. The two faces of the third (outer) arch were made by the same hand (figs. 93, 94). The four seated figures of prophets at the springing of the semicircular arch are reduced versions of the

⁸⁶ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli V/5*, M. 1 (= pl. 233); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 168.

⁸⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, p. 12, nos. 91-93, 97.

⁸⁸ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 167 ff. with earlier bibliography; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 295.

large seated evangelists from the former iconostasis (fig. 45 ff.). The chief difference, excepting that of scale, is that the figures of the arch are more fully rounded, with the relief more deeply undercut than is the case in the panels. The busts of prophets on the inside of the arch, and of apostles on its face, with Christ in the apex of the former and the Virgin of the latter, are fitted into the spaces between the acanthus scrolls. On the face of the arch, the scrolls appear fused with the perforated bosses, which, instead of being isolated, are completely encompassed by whirls of leaves.

The full plastic treatment of these reliefs is found again in the sculptures which adorn the arch of the former south entrance, on the exterior of the present Cappella Zeno (fig. 95). The inside of the arch is covered with scrolls enclosing busts of prophets, as in the outer arch of the Porta dei Fiori. The south arch, however, has suffered so much from later reworking that a definite relationship between it and the arch of the Porta dei Fiori cannot now be established. In particular, the bottom motif, showing two classicising genii holding a vase, does not appear authentic. Insofar as the general effect can be trusted, it seems that this arch was made later than the Porta dei Fiori.

The sculptured arch of the Cappella Zeno was only the outer frame of a porch which was, perhaps, the richest in the whole of San Marco, not excluding the central doorway. Parts of the decor of the jambs may still be preserved in two relief slabs, formerly in the Stroganoff collection, which are akin to the work of the "clumsy" apprentice of the Heracles Master. Left and right of the doorway were the two magnificent lions now in the Cappella Zeno, and, perched on columns, the two griffins which are still *in situ*.⁸⁹

In the outer arch of the Porta dei Fiori the workshop of the Heracles Master not only reached its apogee but even transcended its original potentialities. The art of the Heracles Master himself had its origin in an attempt to emulate Byzantine reliefs of various periods; the latest models on which he first formed his style were of the late twelfth or the early thirteenth century. As his own and his workshop's activities developed, however, new influences reached Venice and were assimilated. These influences, which ranged from the late Romanesque zigzag style to the increasingly organic style of early Gothic, brought about a deviation from Byzantine canons. How far this deflection from the original aims of the workshop went becomes evident in the development of tendrils and leaves, which in the reliefs of the Porta Sant' Alipio are rendered organically with their ribs and veins, and are far removed from the abstract palmettes of Byzantine works such as the iconostasis of Nerez (1164) and the *sopraporte* of the Kariye Camii (ca. 1330⁹⁰), which, though separated by an interval of more than a century and a half, have more in common with each other than either has with the Venetian decorations.

⁸⁹ Cf. R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 295. A similar iconographic arrangement with griffins and lions is to be seen in portals at Studenica and Dečani, Serbia (M. Pupin, *Dečani*, pl. XXXV ff.). These portals are perhaps copies of a Venetian model, which in turn, was undoubtedly influenced by Antelamesque portals. On the two fragments of jambs from the Stroganoff collection, see L. Pollak and A. Muñoz, *Pièces*, II, p. 115, pl. LXXXVI.

⁹⁰ On the iconostasis of Nerez see N. L. Okunev, "Altarnaya pregrada," pls. III, IV; on the Kariye Camii, see *supra*, note 81.

At the beginning of the last quarter of the thirteenth century a new wave of Greek influence seems to have reached Venice, namely the impact of the renascent art of Byzantium. It is quite possible that this new style—the Palaeologan—made its appearance in Constantinopolitan sculpture even before the establishment of the Palaeologan dynasty and that its further development was shaped by the clash of Byzantine and early Gothic forms, with the possible addition of Slavic and Oriental elements. Perhaps the birth of this art was not confined to Constantinople proper. The entire Balkans, and possibly even Venice itself, that is, all art centers in which Greek art and Greek artists came in contact with the new tendencies of Western art, may have had their share in the new development. All the same, Constantinople itself must have played a more important and a more active part than has been hitherto assumed. We know now that book illumination went on in the capital during the Latin Empire, and we have good reason for assuming the same for monumental painting.⁹¹ Why, then, should not there have been a parallel movement in decorative sculpture? It is true that hardly any churches were built in Constantinople in the Latin period; but smaller works, as well as tombs and secular decorations, may have been commissioned at that time even more frequently and freely than under the auspices of the orthodox *basileis* and patriarchs under whom sculpture was almost in abeyance. The artists who upheld this activity in the capital and who helped to shape the new style were certainly Greeks. They were still held superior to all others by general renown.

Thus it can be assumed with a high degree of probability that the features and elements which the Venetian sculptural decorations under review share with Constantinopolitan ones are, at least in part, of Byzantine origin and were introduced into Venice in the course of the thirteenth century. Such are: the placing of half-length figures of Christ or the Virgin on the pointed tips or in the summits of arches, and of hovering or standing angels in spandrels; the combination of a finely differentiated flat relief, with a bold drill technique; the whirling scrolls of spiky acanthus; the use of perforated bosses, etc.

The contact with Byzantium seems to have continued into the last quarter of the century—or rather, to have been taken up again at that time, after an interval caused by the reconquest of Constantinople and the subsequent if shortlived rupture between Venice and Byzantium. It has been said above that political and trade relations between the two powers (severed in 1261) were taken up again in the seventies and eighties of the thirteenth century. To this new rapprochement we owe the last of the sculptured *sopraporta* of San

⁹¹ K. Weitzmann, "Constantinopolitan Book Illumination." That monumental painting lived on in Constantinople is suggested by written sources, by the Byzantine elements in Serbian fresco painting of the thirteenth century (esp. Mileševo and Sopoćani) which must have derived from a "living" art, and by the sudden emergence of Palaeologan art in Constantinople itself immediately after the return of the Greeks in 1261. To this period, the second half of the thirteenth century, I should now be inclined to ascribe the Deesis in the south gallery of Hagia Sophia (T. Whittemore, *The Mosaics*, IV). For an entirely different view about the role of Constantinople, see S. Bettini, "I mosaici." This problem, which I have discussed in my paper "Die Entstehung des Paläologenstils in der Malerei" [*Berichte zum XI. Internat. Byzantinisten-Kongress* (Munich, 1958), IV, 2], will be considered at length in the volume on the mosaics of San Marco. See also *supra*, note 81.

Marco: the one above the Porta di San Giovanni, which leads from the north transept into the north wing of the atrium and forms the inside of the Porta della Madonna (fig. 96). Its repertory of forms is familiar from the other side portals: Christ Emanuel in the apex, half figures of angels in the spandrels, a frame made up of acanthus foliage and formalized vine scrolls, all surmounting a Saracenic arch. Nevertheless, the difference is striking. There is hardly any trace left of the elegance and technical finesse of the Porta Sant'Alipio or the Porta dei Fiori (figs. 88-91). The forms are schematic, more geometrical, and flatter. The great period of the workshop has passed. But a new accent is felt in this late and reduced product in which the Heracles Master himself had no part. The relief has a different character. The figures are so generously rounded that the details of faces and draperies seem to be impressed into a soft surface. There are no concave forms, only "padded" convexities separated by grooves. This is, generally speaking, the plastic character of Palaeologan reliefs, especially those of provincial origin. The apprentice who made the *sopraporta* of the north transept returned to the point of departure of his teacher, the Heracles Master: he copied Byzantine sculpture. In the interval, however, Byzantine sculpture had changed. At the time of the Heracles Master late Comnenian elements were still in conflict with the new movement; now the new Palaeologan style was fully developed.

One thing, however, is common to all Venetian sculpture inspired by spoils from Byzantium. The relief was not, as it were, built up; the projecting forms do not contrast with the smooth background, as in contemporary western sculpture; instead the relief is carved out of the upper surface. In Venetian reliefs of this kind, the background has no aesthetic significance. It is either veiled in shadow or blotted out by the glitter of a gold foil. Thus, the relief consists, aesthetically speaking, not so much of projecting forms as of shapes that were left over after the spaces between them had been hollowed out. The Venetian relief, like the majority of Byzantine reliefs, is "surface-differentiation" rather than genuine, three-dimensional sculpture; it is nearer to painting than to plastic art.

D. ORIENTALIZING DECORATIVE SCULPTURE. Another branch of the Byzantinizing current of Venetian sculpture combined with a strong Saracenic current to produce an enormous number of decorative reliefs with animal and vegetal motifs and, more rarely, with human figures. This production seems to have continued well into the fifteenth century. The two most frequent shapes of these reliefs are roundels and upright rectangles topped with ogees and framed with double dentils (fig. 24). Both forms, but more especially the latter, are certainly derived from Islamic window screens, revetments, etc., in wood, stucco, or marble. The animal patterns themselves go back, ultimately, to Byzantine prototypes of the fifth and sixth centuries, but many of the motifs seem to have been transmitted to the Venetians through the medium of middle-Byzantine art. The early models, as used in middle-Byzantine art, were already interpreted and arranged in a manner which was, to a very large extent, shaped by powerful Islamic influences. To these influences are due

not only the general form but also some of the motifs themselves and, above all, the guiding principles of composition. This is especially clear in the composition of the upright rectangles, a good example of which is to be seen on the west façade of San Marco. In these panels motifs with a certain characteristic curvature (resembling Sassanian leaves) are arranged on top of each other, frequently in symmetrical opposition on either side of a "spinal" axis. The manner in which leaves take on an almost animal movement and, conversely, peacocks and other birds are made to resemble leaves, recalls Islamic stucco and ivory carvings of the Fatimid period. Another Islamic trait is the very dense arrangement of forms covering the ground almost completely, while the flat surfaces appear to form a decorative pattern.

Venice was only one of the many Mediterranean centers of this decorative style. Bari was another. The products of the latter city resemble the Venetian ones very closely. But the style in its more general form ranged from Egypt to Spain. It became in the thirteenth century one of the elements which helped to shape the specifically Venetian style of decorative sculpture.⁹²

It is difficult to imagine which course the development of Venetian sculpture would have taken had it consisted exclusively of Byzantine and Islamic elements and remained undisturbed by other influences and tendencies. Very likely, it would have been at a dead end before long, or would have lost itself in virtuosity. Or, since it would have been difficult for anyone to outdo the skill of the Heracles Master in his later works, it would have ended in growing conventionalism, with the sculptors producing by rote empty decorations of a superficial prettiness. None of this happened because Venetian sculpture was transformed and revived by the forces of Romanesque sculpture which were also active at this time. A monument of the symbiosis of these various elements is, for instance, found in the south porch, where the Byzantinizing and classicizing reliefs of the Heracles Master's workshop appeared side by side with the purely Romanesque lions of the Antelami school. It was, however, left to the sculptors of the central porch to forge the symbiosis into a genuine synthesis.

E. THE CENTRAL PORCH. The largest complex of the sculptural decoration of San Marco is assembled around the central porch (fig. 65 ff.) and consists of the reliefs of three concentric arches. As both the soffits and the frontage are covered with reliefs, there are, all in all, six arches. Two of the three archivolts frame the door itself; the third surrounds the apse-like niche of the central porch. The mosaic adorning the latter is thus included in the iconographic program of the decor. As a matter of fact, the mosaic is not only a part of the

⁹² There exists no comprehensive study of Veneto-Saracenic decorative sculpture. For brief treatments see *La Basilica*, Testo, p. 141 f. and H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 119 ff. See also *infra*, note 99. The best Venetian examples are in the Staatl. Museen, Berlin. See O. Wulff, *Mittelalterliche Bildwerke*, 2nd edit. p. 36 ff. In the following we name a few Islamic examples of the kind which influenced the Venetian production. These examples come from various regions and can be found in the current handbooks: stone reliefs in Seville, the Alhambra and Merrakesh; stuccoes in Fermez (Central Asia), woodcarvings in Cairo (from Fustat; door of Quala'un Mosque, carvings from Moristan Hospital); ivories from Mesopotamia (Louvre) and Spain (Madrid, Florence); paintings on the ceiling of the Palatine Chapel of Palermo.

program, but conveys its central theme, namely, the Last Judgement. This scene welds all the other representations together into one logical system akin to those of the historiated doorways of French cathedrals with their archivolts surrounding a sculptural tympanum showing Christ as the Supreme Judge.⁹³ The main porch of San Marco is indeed nothing but an adaptation of a French program to the special conditions and requirements of Venice. It did not lie within the possibilities of Venetian art to fill the tympanum with a large relief of the Last Judgement; mosaic, as the most Venetian of all the arts, took its place. Nor would it have been possible for a Venetian sculptor to follow the example of French portals in placing monumental statues in the jambs left and right of the door. Such statuary—an integral part of French façade decorations in the second half of the twelfth and in the thirteenth century—lay outside the scope of the Venetian sculptors. They were unable even to adopt a modified version of the French scheme, such as we find, for instance, in Borgo San Donnino where monumental figures are placed in separate niches or recesses on either side of the door.⁹⁴ The clustered columns of the façade left no room for such additions, or for vertical reliefs. The two slabs formerly in the Stroganoff collection (Rome) cannot have belonged to the central door; they were probably part of the south entrance (the present Zeno chapel) or of the former door of the north transept, later replaced by the Cappella S. Isidoro. Thus, of the sculptured decoration characteristic of the French models there remained only the three arches which frame the mosaic of the Last Judgement inside and out. Even in this abridged form, and despite the Venetian character of the detail, the program is still an incongruity in the main façade of San Marco. It has little in common with the rest of the façade program and has no specific relationship to the shrine of the state Patron's relics, the story of which is told in the mosaics of the tympana above the side doors. The only part of the sculptural decoration of the central porch which is related in subject matter to that of the lateral doors is also the least telling from the iconographic point of view. This is the series of prophets in the outer arch, a subject which can be made to fit any place and be inserted into any program. It seems to have been used here as a space filler after all other subjects had been exhausted, though in a sense it can be considered as part of the representation of the Last Judgement.

The program is to be "read" from the center outward, that is from the soffit of the smallest, innermost arch to the front of the largest one. If the series of prophets is set aside, the program moves from the general to the particular, from the spiritual to the secular, and from the abstract to the concrete. The soffit of the innermost arch shows symbolic figures, mostly animals, fighting or acting as the protagonists of fables; on the face of the arch the actors of the symbolic scenes are human beings, both children and adults. In the next arch the symbols have been replaced by allegories; the soffit shows allegorical figures of the Months, the front, personifications of the Virtues. Finally, the last arch contains a most astonishing catalogue of trades and occupations—astonishing

⁹³ The "Beaulieu-type" of E. Mâle (*Religious Art*, p. 51, and *L'art du ... XII siècle*, p. 406ff.).

⁹⁴ G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, figs. 367ff.

in so far as these genre scenes of human activities are not at all allegorized or generalized images, but very concrete representations of Venetian life. The series of prophets on the front of the arch, with Christ in the apex, is prefixed to this entire system as a kind of titlepage.⁹⁵

As has been said above, this system receives its deeper meaning from the mosaic representation of the Last Judgement. Every detail, in fact, from the vague, symbolic hints of the inner arch to the very practical demonstrations of the way in which trades and professions should be exercised, relates to the realm of ethics. The sculptural decor of the main porch is thus a condensed *Speculum Mundi*, a mirror of Christian virtue and—a characteristic Venetian touch—of civic virtue. It is a rather belated attempt to give to San Marco some sort of "cathedral character" as befitted the state church of Venice.

The form in which this attempt was realized, is far removed from that of French cathedral sculpture. The principle of the plastic decoration of the central porch of San Marco, namely the placing of the figure decor in concentrically arranged arches densely covered with relief, is to be found most frequently around the Adriatic and further east, from Dalmatia and Apulia to Serbia. The Apulian examples, such as San Nicola of Bari and Troia, are especially close to San Marco. They precede it in date, but there is no possibility of establishing a direct filiation one way or the other.⁹⁶

a. *Soffit of First Arch* (figs. 68-71).⁹⁷ It is in keeping with the practical mentality of the Venetians that the vague, symbolic part of the *Speculum Mundi* should have been relegated to the smallest and darkest arch. Quite possibly, its symbolism was no longer understood, with the exception of the more easily comprehensible fables. Generally speaking, the Italians of the thirteenth century had little taste for the *ridicula monstrositas, mira quaedam deformis formositas ac formosa deformitas* against which Saint Bernard had fought more than a century before.⁹⁸ There is little that could be called specifically Christian in the iconography of the reliefs of this arch. Exceptions are, perhaps, the little figure fighting a lion, who might represent Samson, and also the two allegories of Terra (or Luxuria?) and Oceanus (or Man in the bondage of Sin?), which seem to hold aloft the entire arrangement of tendrils that support and enclose all the other representations. Some of these representations belong to the age-old repertory of mediaeval symbolism; the lion devouring the stag, the eagle with the hare, the dog attacking the deer, the fox and the bird. Others seem to be purely decorative, at least in the forms in which they are here depicted—witness

⁹⁵ See J. Durand, "Iconographie"; A. Vardanega, "Nella Basilica"; G. Musolino, *La Basilica*, p. 67 ff. For façade programs in general, see J. Sauer, *Symbolik*, p. 308 ff.; E. Mâle, *L'art ... du XII^e siècle*, *passim*, esp. 377 ff. On the animated scroll in Roman art see J. M. C. Toynbee and J. B. Ward Perkins, "Peopled Scrolls."

⁹⁶ Good characterizations of the Venetian type of portal decoration as compared and contrasted to those of other Italian centers in P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 794 ff. and R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 289 ff. For stylistic analyses see also L. Coletti, "Intorno," p. 74 ff.

⁹⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Tesio*, p. 246 ff.; *Dettagli*, V/2, 128a-c; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 169; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 290, pl. CXXII, 2, 3.

⁹⁸ *Bernardi Abbatis Claravallensis Opera*, I, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, CLXXXII, col. 915 ff.; On the interpretation of animal symbolism see J. Sauer, *Symbolik*, p. 313 ff.; E. Mâle, *L'art*, p. 332 ff.; W. v. Blankenburg, *Heilige*. Bibliography in L. Réau, *Iconographie*, I, p. 138 ff.

the pair of camels and the two birds with their long intertwined necks. There is, at any rate, nothing very deep in this symbolism, nothing which draws on the possibilities offered by the Physiologus and other symbolic writings. One feels that the artists, while complying with the dictates of an antiquated program, took every opportunity of escaping into the field of pure decoration. In this field they reached, indeed, magnificent effects. There is very little in the art of this period that can compare, for instance, with the elegance of the intertwined animals. Compared with the masterly treatment of complex patterns, the artist's clumsiness in depicting the human figure is almost inexplicable. Seen by themselves, "Terra," "Oceanus," and "Samson" look like the crude attempts of a naive artist of the early twelfth century and not like the productions of an over-refined sculptor of the thirteenth, a sculptor who knew the contemporary art of Apulia and had pronounced Oriental leanings. This sculptor was surely a highly specialized artist, a master decorator, who was not interested in the representation of the human figure, and who found his models in early prototypes, possibly oriental ones.⁹⁹ The motif of the intertwined animals may be derived from book illumination, probably from bestiaries.¹⁰⁰ Of course, the basic pattern, the scroll with figures and animals, had been used since the early twelfth century in Italian sculpture, e.g. by Willigelmus in Modena,¹⁰¹ and was still in fashion in the first half of the thirteenth century, not only in the north but also in the south of Italy.¹⁰²

It is to this period that the reliefs must belong, namely to the beginning of the second quarter of the thirteenth century. The reliefs are thus earlier than those of the Porta Sant'Alipio: their conventionalized leaves are not botanically definable nor have the tendrils themselves any organic life. The animals, too, bear fewer individual characteristics than those of the Porta Sant'Alipio or of the *sopraporta* of the Tesoro. Whether the work is to be dated before or after the two porch decorations south of the main door, can hardly be stated with certainty. There is, in any case, no great interval of time between them, but the central arch is the work of a different hand, indeed of a different workshop.

b. Front of First Arch (figs. 72, 73). The workshop that executed the soffit must have employed several artists who, working, as they did, under the guidance of one leading master, nevertheless retained a good deal of individuality. The front of the first arch, for instance, shows a different hand but follows a canon of forms similar to that of the soffit. The reliefs of this archivolt are the least intelligible part of the program.¹⁰³ Were it not for the very

⁹⁹ For the oriental parallels and, possibly, sources, see A. Grabar, "Trônes épiscopaux" and *supra*, note 92.

¹⁰⁰ G. C. Druce, "The Mediaeval Bestiaries."

¹⁰¹ Modena: P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 758, fig. 482; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, pls. XIV ff. Pavia, San Michele: *Ibid.*, pl. XXII ff. Lucca, San Michele: G. H. Crichton, *Romanesque Sculpture*, fig. 62.

¹⁰² Bari, San Nicola: M. Wackernagel, "Die Plastik," p. 100 ff.; Troia, cathedral; Fossacesia: P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 847, fig. 576 (ca. 1230). Similar forms are found in Serbia, e.g. in Studenica (ca. 1200): G. Millet, *L'ancien art*, p. 82 and A. Deroko, *Monumentalna ... arhitektura*, figs. 66-73; also at Decani: M. Pupin, *Decani*, pl. XXIX, etc.

¹⁰³ *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 248, *Dettagli*, V/2, 128, 128a (= pls. 89, 90); V/3, 128b, 128c (= pls. 91, 92); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 169 ff., both with detailed descriptions. A. Venturi, *Storia*, III, p. 356 ff.

specific cast of some of the scenes, one might regard the whole as just another instance of the customary mediaeval "putto-genre," familiar from decorated initials or "inhabited" acanthus scrolls. In any case, none of the interpretations proffered so far is satisfactory,¹⁰⁴ nor does our present state of knowledge enable us to say more than that the scenes belong, most probably, to that class of representations which expresses the dualistic nature of life. Whether the two principles are Good and Evil, active and contemplative life, or any other pair of opposite ideas, the artist has not expressed them very clearly. Perhaps, the most fitting designation of this "putto-genre" with its ethical twist would be: "the Way of the World." It is certainly the image of a very unruly world, a world full of sin, violence, and disagreement.

This image is also part of the *Speculum Mundi*. If the reliefs of the inner arch derive their themes from the struggle of hostile forces in nature, those of the archivolt illustrate the conflicts in human life. It is quite possible that this is actually the subject matter which the men who shaped the program had in mind; that in the two faces of the first arch they intended to give a picture of the world as it is or would be without or before the intervention of the forces of order, a picture of the world before its Salvation, a world of brute force and sin.

If these reliefs are a kind of sermon in stone, this sermon is certainly lacking in dignity. The decorative elegance of the first arch and the playful frivolity of the second are equally far removed from the dignity of French or the dryness of Lombard works of this kind. The master of the front of the first arch is thus as typically Venetian as the sculptor of the soffit of the same arch. In other respects, however, their art is quite different in its derivation and in its aims. The sculptor who worked on the soffit of the arch derived some of his motifs from Lombard, others from Apulian and Oriental art; in Apulia, it is San Nicola in Bari¹⁰⁵ which furnishes the closest parallels. Other elements, again, were common property of Romanesque decoration, sculptural and pictorial. Most of it was, if not native, at least at home in Venice in the first half of the thirteenth century. This was not so, however, in the case of the motifs used by the master who worked on the front. With the exception of the tendrils, practically everything in his vocabulary was derived from foreign idioms and was new to Venetian art. His figures bear the stamp of the Antelami workshop and, more particularly, of its French-Gothic component. The nearest parallels in the oeuvre of Benedetto himself are not so much the sculptures of the Parma Baptistery as the sculptural decoration of S. Andrea in Vercelli (main portal).¹⁰⁶ San Marco is later, with a few rather "modern" French traits; the corresponding phase in French sculpture would be the decor of the north transept portals of Chartres.¹⁰⁷ At the same time, the Venetian sculptor's art is undoubtedly derivative if it is compared with Benedetto's original solutions; but it makes

¹⁰⁴ H. von der Gabelentz, *loc. cit.* takes over the arbitrary interpretation of Saccardo in *La Ducale Basilica*, *loc. cit.* R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 291, speaks tentatively "d'une suite d'images des divers âges de la vie."

¹⁰⁵ M. Wackernagel, "Die Plastik," p. 100ff; R. Krautheimer, "San Nicola."

¹⁰⁶ G. De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, p. 387ff., figs. 451ff.

¹⁰⁷ For the relation of Antelamesque (and Paduan) art with Chartres, see G. Nicco Fasola, "L'antico portale."

up for some of the missing qualities by a greater finish, a kind of brilliant, finely chiselled hardness of the surface.

c. *Soffit of Second Arch* (figs. 74-77).¹⁰⁸ In the next phase of the development of the workshop, the scroll or interlace of tendrils, though still clearly traceable, is pushed into the background. The figures, at least the protagonists, have grown in stature, absolutely and relatively. From the point of view of the over-all program of the façade, the reliefs on the soffit of the second arch are most important. They represent, in easily "readable" allegories, one of the "principles of order" which, applied to the chaos of nature and of human passion, produce the cosmos of the Christian world. The allegories of the Months, each with its established occupation, and the signs of the zodiac which accompany these allegories, represent the principle of "order in time," the orderly succession of the activities which together make up the full cycle of the year. In Byzantine church decoration, with its preponderance of the liturgical element, the principle of order in time, the allegorical representation of the year's cycle, was clad in profoundly different forms. It appeared there as one of the aspects of the festival cycle. The interior of the church building, including the decoration which was an integral part of it, was regarded as an "image" of the Christian year. Not only the christological scenes, but to a certain extent even the portraits of saints were arranged according to the liturgical sequence of the ecclesiastic festivals.¹⁰⁹ Thus, the element of order in time was for the Byzantines primarily a principle of arrangement deduced through interpretation, while Italy and the West required more palpable allegories. This does not mean, of course, that the allegories of the Months were unknown or never used in Byzantium; on the contrary, they were a heritage from classical antiquity, in which the East and the West had almost equal shares.¹¹⁰ But in mediaeval Byzantium the representation of these allegories was confined to book illumination and had no part in the program of church decoration. The iconography of the Venetian cycle illustrating the Labors of the Months has been studied at length by Strzygowski, Von der Gabelentz, D'Ancona, and others; it appears to be a typical instance of Venetian eclecticism, freely compounded from Byzantine and western (Italian) traditions.¹¹¹ The combination of the allegories of the Months and the signs of the zodiac is the rule in Italian sculpture of the thirteenth century, especially in the circle of Antelami. The Ducento shares this peculiarity with Byzantine cycles, with those of France, and with earlier Italian mosaic representations, while Lombard sculpture of the twelfth century kept the two cycles separate. Apart from Antelamesque (Italo-French) elements,

¹⁰⁸ *La ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 249, *Dettagli*, V/2, 127a-d; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 174ff.; A. Venturi, *Storia*, III, p. 359ff.; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 795f.; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 291; R. Pallucchini, *I mesi*.

¹⁰⁹ O. Demus, *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration*, p. 15ff.

¹¹⁰ P. d'Ancona, *L'uomo*, p. 89ff.; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Die kirchliche Kunst*, p. 233ff.; O. Koseleff, *Die Monatsdarstellungen*; D. Levi, "The Allegories"; G. Rasetti, *Il calendario*; D. S. Rice, "The Seasons"; H. Stern, *Le Calendrier*, p. 203ff.; J. Strzygowski, "Die Monatszyklen"; J. C. Webster, *The Labours*; H. Stern, "Poésies."

¹¹¹ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 174ff.; J. Strzygowski, "Die Monatszyklen," p. 44ff.; P. d'Ancona, *L'uomo*, p. 89ff.

we also find in San Marco some clearly distinguishable Byzantine traits: February is pictured as an old man warming his hands and feet at a fire, as in Byzantine (and sometimes also in French) cycles. Italian representations show, as a rule, the pruning of trees or fishing as the specific activities of this month. The allegory of March is another instance of the Venetian workshop's preference for the Byzantine type. The fully armed warrior (Mars), the only allegory of this month that occurs in Byzantine cycles, is quite unknown to Italian cycles. Except for San Marco it appears only once in a western monument, namely in the sculptures of the main portal of Traù (Trogir) in Dalmatia, which are clearly dependent on Venice. The Byzantine type for April, the shepherd carrying a lamb, is found only in Venice, Otranto, and Traù (in the last monument with certain variations); that for May, the crowning of a youth with flowers, recurs in the fourteenth-century sculptures of the door of the Eremitani church in Padua, a monument inspired by the Venetian model. In some other Italian cycles in which this motif is also used, it relates to April and not to May. Other instances of the Byzantine inspiration of the Venetian cycle are the allegories of August (heat: sleeping figure with fan) and October (bird-catching). The allegories of June and July, as well as of October and November, are interchanged as compared with Byzantine cycles. This shows not so much a certain carelessness on the part of the men who arranged the Venetian program, as, perhaps, a characteristic attitude on the part of the artist to whom composition was more important than a slavish compliance with the Byzantine formula for the cycle. In fact the sculptor of the arch did not really follow the conventional Byzantine cycle; he only borrowed from it, adhering on the whole to an entirely different prototype, namely the scheme adopted by the Antelami workshop for their versions of the cycle in the Parma baptistery, Borgo San Donnino, and other places.¹¹² Thus, there is no single monument that could be considered as the model for the San Marco sculptures; these, however, became the models for a number of later cycles. Above all, the compositional arrangement and the stylistic presentation are entirely the invention and the artistic property of the Venetian workshop. The framing of the various motifs by acanthus scrolls, which is quite in keeping with the Venetian development, is not found in other Italian cycles, though it does occur in France (Saint-Denis).

The recently ascertained fact that two plaques of the so-called Carrand ivories of the Bargello contain four representations which are closely related to the Venetian cycle of the Months might lead to the view that both cycles were derived from a common Byzantine prototype, such as a cycle of ivory reliefs. On close inspection, however, it becomes quite clear that the Carrand plaques depend directly on the reliefs of San Marco. The allegory of October (fig. 76) is rendered in San Marco by the figure of a young man digging with a spade. The long handle of the spade is held in a steeply diagonal line in front of the body, and the blade seems to disappear behind the equine part of the centaur, the zodiacal sign of Sagittarius. Now, the Muhammedan carver of the related

¹¹² G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, fig. 298ff. (Parma); fig. 446ff. (Borgo San Donnino); fig. 486ff. (Cremona); fig. 510ff. (Ferrara); fig. 524ff. (Arezzo).

representation of the Carrand reliefs, who did not grasp the significance of his prototype, misunderstood completely the action of the figure. He interpreted the spade as a lance and the centaur (*Sagittarius*) as a lion, making of the whole group a representation of lion-hunting. This in itself would not exclude the possibility that both sculptors, the Venetian and the Muhammedan, reproduced a common prototype, the one understanding it correctly, the other misinterpreting it. But one fact speaks strongly for the Venetian relief having been the direct model for the Carrand carving: the centaur, the proximity of whose body to the spade was the cause of the error committed by the ivory carver, does not belong to the allegory of October but to that of November. This latter month is represented in the Venetian cycle immediately below the picture for October, in such a form that its zodiacal sign is placed at the feet of the allegory of October and seems to be pierced by the spade. This arrangement is unique and it must, therefore, have been invented for the special requirements of the Venetian porch. Thus the Carrand carving must have been directly inspired by the Venetian reliefs and cannot be regarded as evidence of the existence of a common prototype.¹¹³

A thoroughly Venetian addition to the cycle of the months is the half-length figure of Christ Emmanuel in the apex of the arch. This crowning motif was used on two of the side doors of San Marco; there, however, Christ appears as an almost full-length figure while here He is enclosed in a circle studded with stars in relief, and accompanied on either side by disks with the heads of Sun and Moon extending their hands in supplication. The central motif, the youthful Christ-Emmanuel surrounded by a medallion set with stars, is to be found once more in San Marco: it is the central motif of the mosaic in the easternmost cupola, and it is very likely that the sculptor was in fact inspired by this mosaic. The two accompanying heads were copied from a different context. Though the head of the Sun is surrounded by rays and that of the Moon by a crescent, the two heads in their attitude of adoration are clearly copied from a representation of the *Deesis*. The bearded head of the Sun follows exactly the type of St. John; the personification of the Moon is female, with long hair, and corresponds to the usual type of representations of the Virgin.

The penchant for borrowing from various contexts is typically Venetian. The sculptor's great achievement is to have produced not a pasticcio but a work of art with an identity of its own. Nowhere but in Venice could we expect a similar aptitude for arranging "spoils"—in both the concrete and metaphorical meanings of this word—so ingeniously that the product presents itself as a homogeneous whole.

This is, of course, the effect of the uniform and persuasive language of style, in which the various motifs and borrowed details have been harmonized by an artist of great talent, an artist superior to the two masters who were responsible for the reliefs of the first arch. He had received his training in the circle of

¹¹³ D. S. Rice, "The Seasons," p. 31 ff., pl. 19. The other changes made by the Islamic artist are "corrections" in the sense of Muhammedan ideas and tenets. Thus bird catching is replaced by hunting and, most characteristically, the butchering of a pig by the killing of an antelope.

Antelami. In the execution of the cycle of the Months, he was assisted by help-mates, who, however, do not emerge as identifiable personalities. In view of the superiority of his work it is possible to regard the Master of the Calendar cycle as the leading master of the plastic decoration of the central doorway.

For dating the Calendar cycle we have a *terminus ante quem*: one of the assistants of the master collaborated in a signed and dated work on the other side of the Adriatic. His hand can be seen in the sculptural decoration of the west portal of Traù Cathedral which bears the date 1240.¹¹⁴ This decoration is a very complex work in which more than one artist collaborated. The chief master gives his name as Raduanus (Radovan). Undoubtedly he was a native of Dalmatia who learned his craft mainly in Venice. This must be concluded from the style of the tympanum, the inner archivolt, and some of the jamb reliefs, which are by far the finest parts of the entire decoration and, therefore, most likely the work of the chief master. The very competent style of these reliefs is unmistakably derived from that of the Master of the Calendar cycle of San Marco. In addition, a part of the program was also taken over; indeed, the abridged cycle of the Months (of which there are only six) reveals, sometimes even in details, the inspiration of San Marco. The conclusion is not only permissible but almost inescapable that Radovan was one of the craftsmen who, under the leadership of the chief master of the central portal of San Marco, executed its reliefs. But Radovan was not the only one of the sculptors of Traù to have received his training in Venice. Another, less competent craftsman carved the left part of the outer archivolt.¹¹⁵ Having absorbed the style of the reliefs of the face of the first (innermost) arch of the Venetian portal, he brought some French elements into the Traù ensemble. He or his master also transplanted to Traù the Venetian acanthus. Yet a third master of the Traù portal seems to have come from Venice. The section of the portal in question is that comprising a group of standing figures in long garments with many parallel folds and oblique zigzag seams, depicted in an extremely awkward stance, with their feet set wide apart. These motifs, and, in fact, the entire arrangement of these figures, are derived from two of the angels in the central square of San Marco, namely, the artistically inferior western pair (fig. 100).

The Venetian angels are so close to the comparable figures in Traù that it seems permissible to see in them the work of a journeyman who originally came from Dalmatia, was active in the Antelamesque workshop at San Marco, and after his return to his country, shed some of the refinements he acquired during his Italian apprenticeship, and "turned native" again.¹¹⁶

Thus the San Marco cycle of the Months must have been in existence by 1240. In all likelihood it was completed shortly before that year; the reliefs of Traù show

¹¹⁴ C. M. Iveković, *Dalmatien's Architektur*, I, Traù, pls. 12 ff., 43; A. Venturi, *Storia*, III, p. 350 ff.; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, pp. 798, 897; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 297 ff.; C. Fisković, *Radovan*. The parts of the sculptures of Traù (Trogir) which must be ascribed to Radovan himself are reproduced *ibid.*, pls. 5-12, 35-41, 51-53, 56, 57.

¹¹⁵ The reliefs belonging to the oeuvre of the second master are reproduced by C. Fisković, *Radovan*, pls. 13-22. A third hand is apparent in pls. 23-28.

¹¹⁶ C. Fisković, *Radovan*, pls. 58 ff., 45. On the different hands to be distinguished in the Traù sculptures, *ibid.*, p. xxxvii.

quite clearly that the two or three sculptors who had collaborated in the Venetian cycle went to work in Dalmatia with their Venetian experiences still fresh in their minds.

For our knowledge of the development of sculpture in Venice it is of the greatest importance that we should be able to assign a date in the thirties of the thirteenth century—and probably in the latter half of that decade—to the allegories of the Months. Some of the protomes of the corbel table in the aisles of the church (fig. 97) show an unmistakable similarity to the heads of the “clumsy angels” of the central square, as well as to the reliefs of the Months in the second archivolt of the central porch. Most of the heads, for instance, in the tribune of the southwest pier supporting the central cupola are quite clearly the work of the sculptor who carved the heads and faces of March and April in the cycle of the Months. In view of the complete identity of features and technique there is no need for an elaborate comparison.

d. Front of Second Arch (figs. 78, 79).¹¹⁷ Very nearly the same date and certainly the same author must be assumed for the reliefs on the front of the second arch, which represent allegories of Virtues and Beatitudes. Some of the seventeen figures carry attributes which make their identification possible; others have been identified by remnants of inscriptions.¹¹⁸ To follow the latter may, however, be misleading, since these inscriptions might have been added or altered at a later period. According to these indications, the series (from left to right round the arch) is as follows: Spes, Caritas, an unidentified figure, Abstinencia, Compulsio (Compunctio), Patientia, Castitas, Humilitas, Constantia (at the apex of the arch), Modestia (?), Misericordia, Benignitas, Prudentia, Temperantia, Fides, Justitia, and Fortitudo. This order does not coincide with the enumeration in Matthew 5:3-11. Nor do the figures of the Virtues conform to the “dynamic” type of representation so often found in book illumination and in Romanesque as well as early Gothic façade decorations. While the “dynamic” type shows the Psychomachia, the struggle between Virtues and Vices, with the former triumphing over the latter, the figures of San Marco adhere to the static type of allegoric personifications. This type, with figures shown standing or seated, was not uncommon in sculpture. The more usual form of representation, however, was in the shape of medallions containing busts or seated figures, as, e.g., in Paris, Chartres, Amiens, Parma, Piacenza, Borgo San Donnino, and also in Italian pavements.¹¹⁹ In San Marco eight figures—four on either side—are standing, two half kneeling, and seven seated, the central one (Constantia) frontally. This cycle of seventeen figures is one of the most complete known to us: the few that surpass it consist mostly

¹¹⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 250ff.; *Dettagli* V/2, 127-127d (= pls., 84-88); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 185ff.; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 292ff.

¹¹⁸ The inscriptions are given in A. Robertson, *The Bible*, p. 37ff., in part after *La Ducale Basilica*, *loc. cit.*

¹¹⁹ On the iconography of the Virtues see A. Katzenellenbogen, *Allegories*, with bibliography. On the San Marco Virtues, *ibid.*, p. 52ff.; valuable additions and specific information with regard to Italian Romanesque sculpture are to be found in G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, p. 223ff., p. 246; note 400, p. 471, note 23, with bibliography. In France, the seated figure is more frequent than the standing one (e.g. Saintonge, Poitou).

of half-length figures, as for example, that on Nicholas of Verdun's ambo re-vestment of 1181 in Klosterneuburg near Vienna. None of the sculptural cycles of this period can vie in extent with that of San Marco. For instance, the number of Virtues represented by Antelami in Parma is only twelve.

Thus, the extent of the cycle would argue for its having been inspired by, or copied from, works of painting—that is, miniatures, enamels, or frescoes. As a matter of fact, the model of the series is to be found in San Marco itself. The figures were copied from the mosaic of the central cupola.¹²⁰ Since in the drum of this cupola there are sixteen windows between which the Virtues are arranged, there was room for only sixteen allegories, whereas the arrangement of the cycle in the archivolt, with a central figure in the apex of the arch, made the inclusion of a seventeenth figure necessary. The interpolated figure (the third from the left) is not identifiable with certainty; Saccardo's identification of it as "Oratio" is not based on sufficient evidence.¹²¹ The chief difference between the mosaics and the reliefs was brought about by the shape of the arch, which forced the sculptor to arrange some of the figures in seated positions, and two in kneeling positions, while in the cupola all sixteen are standing or, rather, walking and dancing. The seated figures lost, of course, their characteristic attitudes and, with them, something of their similarity to the mosaics; in the case of the standing figures, however, the resemblance is so close that the two are almost identical, as far as the lines of the figures are concerned.

In theory, of course, it would be possible to assume an inverse relationship between the two cycles. The priority of invention might have lain with the sculptor, and the mosaicist might have copied his figures from the reliefs of the central doorway. This assumption would be very tempting in view of the fact that the cycle is in its legitimate place in the framework of the sculptural façade decoration, while it is quite exceptional in mosaic decoration.¹²² It is extraneous to mosaics in general and more particularly to the iconographical system realized in San Marco. On the façade the cycle of Virtues fits into the program of the *Speculum Mundi*, representing the ethical aspect of the forces of order; in the interior the cycle of the Virtues and Beatitudes is, at least at first glance, out of place in a mosaic composition which represents the Ascension of Christ. However, a closer inspection shows that this incongruity is more apparent than real: the inscription of the Ascension mosaic refers to the eschatological aspect of the theme, i.e. to the Second Coming of the Lord and the Last Judgment, a context in which the allegories of Virtues and Beatitudes have a legitimate place. Moreover, a comparison between the mosaic figures and the reliefs makes

¹²⁰ This was first noticed by C. Schnaase, *Geschichte*, VII, p. 290. For illustrations see S. Bettini, *Mosaici antichi*, pls. XVI, XIX-XXIII and A. Robertson, *The Bible*, with descriptions and plates, pp. 281-291.

¹²¹ *La Ducale Basilica*, Testo, p. 252; A. Robertson, *The Bible*, p. 39, with Modestia and the unknown figure interchanged.

¹²² The figures of Caritas, Fides, and Spes which appear in the mosaics of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo and of the cathedral of Monreale, are not allegories of Virtues but Holy Women: see O. Demus, *The Mosaics*, pp. 46, 120.

it abundantly clear that the latter are directly inspired by the former,¹²³ and that the close relationship between the two cycles cannot be explained by the assumption that both are copies of a common model.

That the priority lies with the mosaics can be concluded from the fact that some of the reliefs contain details which are clearly mistakes made by the careless copying of the correct forms of the mosaics. For instance, in the mosaics Justitia carries in her left hand a box which contains the weights for the scales she is holding in her right hand. This box is an oval object with an open lid. In the relief (where Justitia appears as the second figure from the bottom counting from the right, fig. 79) the box has been replaced by a nearly globular vase or vessel with a short neck, an object which has nothing to do with the process of weighing. Another instance is Fides, who in the mosaic holds a sceptre with a fleur-de-lys finial characteristic of the twelfth century. On the façade (where Fides is shown immediately above Justitia) the scepter has assumed a nearly vegetal form resembling an iris. In this case the alteration was not due to careless copying but to technical factors: the thin shaft of the scepter had to be strengthened by the addition of leaves in order to make possible its execution in stone. Other alterations resulted from compositional demands: the narrow archivolt offered less room than the mosaicist had at his disposition. Some gestures and flying folds had, therefore, to be altered in order to fit into the given space of the arch. Towards the top, of course, the figures had to be represented kneeling, reclining, or seated. If the relationship to the mosaic figures is regarded as a sufficient criterion, the sculptor seems to have begun his work at the right-hand spring of the arch (which, of course, is composed of several voussoirs) and to have ended it at the left-hand spring. The standing figures on the left side follow their models less closely. The first figure on the left (fig. 78), with an inscription belonging to "Hope" (Spes), follows fairly closely the "Patience" (Patientia) of the cupola. The next, with an inscription referring to "Charity" (Caritas) resembles the Misericordia of the cupola mosaics, with the exception of her left hand, which is raised in a gesture indicating speech in the mosaic but which hangs down in the relief. The third figure, with both hands stretched out in a gesture of adoration, shows no traces of an inscription nor does it coincide with any of the mosaic figures.

The seated figure in the apex of the arch, which is farthest removed from the prototypal mosaic of the central cupola, points the way towards another set of models which were of importance for the Venetian cycle, not only iconographically but also stylistically. It has been said above that in western Romanesque art the Virtues and the Beatitudes are most frequently represented as seated

¹²³ The secondary character of the porch cycle is made evident not only by the misunderstandings listed below but also by the peculiar order of the arrangement. The series in the cupola conforms with contemporary theology in that Caritas is in the center, while the façade arch is topped by Constantia, with the other figures arranged more or less haphazardly and following principles of form rather than of iconography.

The series of Virtues and Beatitudes was used in Venice again in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when it appeared on some of the capitals of the Doges' Palace. See G. Rossi and G. Salerni, *I capitelli*, pp. 35 ff., 41 ff., 50 ff., 100 ff., 102 ff., 113 ff.

figures. Now, some of the cycles of France and Germany, as well as one in Italy, show seated figures upholding two medallions with heads, one in either hand. This is exactly the formula used for the figure in the apex of the San Marco arch. Among the parallels just quoted is the one which is the nearest geographically, viz. on the exterior of the baptistery of Parma, where four seated figures of the cardinal Virtues are represented, each upholding two medallions filled with the busts of other Virtues—making twelve in all. It is very likely that the master of the Virtues of San Marco derived his central figure from one of the Parma reliefs: the relationship in iconography would thus be parallel to that in style, the Antelamesque element being the basis of his style.¹²⁴

It has been mentioned that the allegories of the Virtues were made by the same master as those of the Months. The softly modelled, full faces with rather thick noses and lips are of the same kind, although those of the Virtues are nearer to the classical ideal of beauty. The little that is left of the acanthus scroll corresponds to the design and the modelling of the leaves which frame the allegories of the Months. There is, however, a new stylistic element in the figures of the Virtues, a new linear rhythm and a new way of bringing out the plastic values of the figures by a curvilinear system of drapery which helps to articulate the body underneath. A glance at the mosaic figures of the Virtues reveals the origin of this new element of style: it is nothing but the translation into relief of the design of the mosaics. Again we witness a phase in the ever-recurring process of the inspiration of Venetian sculpture by an art which, if not Byzantine, is in any case strongly tinged with Byzantine elements. The relationship of the sculptor of the Virtues to the mosaicist may be regarded as a kind of apprenticeship. It is, however, one in which a fully matured master of considerable artistic stature reorientated himself by allowing works which belonged to another realm of the arts to guide his hand. His art was greatly enriched by this new training.

Naturally, being a mature artist, he did not take over schemes and patterns without assimilating them to the requirements of the new medium. In spite of a sometimes close adherence to his models, his forms are fuller, more compact and organic, more suggestive not only of volume but of space. They carry their own space with them, creating a kind of spatial emanation around themselves, full of turbulent rhythm. The proportions of his figures are shorter, making the allegories appear stockier, less slender than the mosaic figures, but this fact must not be regarded as a difference of style, since the latter were meant to be seen from below and were therefore drawn in elongated proportions in order to counteract perspective foreshortening. But it is enough to look at the different shapes of the flying folds and ends of the garments to realize the profound change that the model underwent in the hands of the sculptor. Not only the single figures but the whole archivolt, with its well-spaced decor, has an almost classical character, a kind of Renaissance flavor which is reminis-

¹²⁴ For the seated figure holding two medallions or discs, see A. Katzenellenbogen, *Allegories*, p. 50, 69 ff.; G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, p. 223 ff., p. 246, note 400, p. 471, note 23; the Parma figures, *ibid.*, fig. 263.

cent of the classical phase of French Gothic. It is not only in subject matter that the figures of San Marco recall the series of allegorical reliefs of Virtues and Vices in the central porch of Notre Dame in Paris which is a work of the same period.¹²⁵ Both works contain a Gothic as well as a classical element and it is this fact that binds them together in spite of differences of style. The profoundest of these differences lies in the Byzantine elements of San Marco, which are of course, completely lacking in Paris and in Parma whence the artist drew part of his stylistic equipment. It is a curious fact that only through the medium of Byzantinizing mosaics could the allegories of the Virtues, which, as far as subject matter is concerned, had their origin in programs of façade decoration, return, as it were, to their legitimate place.

e. Soffit of Third Arch (figs. 80-83).¹²⁶ The allegories of the Virtues, excellent as they are, were not the highest achievement of the workshop. The highest tribute must go to the sculptures of the third and largest arch, with the "portraits" of Venetian Trades on its soffit and a beautiful scroll with prophets on its face. The cycle of Trades in the Venetian program takes the place of the *Artes Liberales* which normally appear in French and Italian systems of decoration. Of course, even aside from calendar cycles, representations of Crafts and Trades do occur quite frequently in French and Italian sculpture and painting, as for instance in the stained glass of Chartres, or in the pillars of Piacenza.¹²⁷ In most cases, however, they were not parts of the "official" program but generic donors' portraits, indicating which guild or corporation paid for a window or a column. It is not unlikely that a similar state of affairs obtained in the case of the Venetian reliefs; this arch (and perhaps other parts of the building too) may well have been paid for by the "arti." But in Venice the cycle of the Trades has found its place in a well-ordered, organic system. It represents the effect, as it were, of the working of the powers of order which are symbolized by the Months and the Virtues.

In any case, the Venetian reliefs are by far the most complete and most life-like representations of the Trades in mediaeval sculpture. From left to right the arch contains the following fourteen motifs:

1. An old man with crutches, seated on a bench, traditionally interpreted as the portrait of the architect; another explanation sees in this figure an allegory of Old Age; 2. shipbuilding; 3. selling of wine; 4. selling of bread and fish; 5. trade of the butcher; 6. selling of milk and cheese; 7. building trade. In the apex of the arch there is a disk with a lamb, borne by two angels. Continuing to the right of the apex, one finds: 8. shoemaking; 9. barbershop and surgery;

¹²⁵ P. Clemen (M. Hürlimann), *Gotische Kathedralen*, pl. 12.

¹²⁶ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 252 ff., *Dettagli*, V/2, 126a-e, with detailed description; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 204; A. Robertson, *The Bible*, p. 77 ff.; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 294, pls. CXXV, 3, 4, CXXVI, 1-4; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 796 ff. The traditional interpretation of the Old Man at the left foot of the arch as the architect of San Marco after the Chronicle of Magno (sixteenth century) in *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 253; he is regarded as a symbol of "Old Age" by J. Ruskin, *St. Mark's Rest*, p. 104.

¹²⁷ For the iconography of the "Trades" or *Mestieri*, see H. Von der Gabelentz, *Die kirchliche Kunst*, p. 235 ff.; E. Mâle, *L'art ... du XIII^e siècle*, p. 63 ff.; R. van Marle, *Iconographie*, II, p. 203; P. Brandt, *Schaffende Arbeit*, p. 307 ff., esp. 319. The Piacenza reliefs are reproduced in G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, fig. 10 ff. (p. 18 ff.).

10. cooperage; 11. carpentry; 12. wood-sawing; 13. trade of the blacksmith; and, 14. fishing.

This is not only an exceptionally rich but also a specifically Venetian cycle. It must be assumed that it begins not, as in our enumeration, at the left foot of the arch but at the right, as do all the other cycles of the façade. Thus, "fishing" is the beginning and "shipbuilding" (followed by the single figure of the old man—a merchant?) the end. Between these two poles, which represent the primitive basis of life in the lagoons on the one hand and the foundation of the city's sea-power on the other, the whole compass of the daily life of Venice is spread out. Although the idea of such a cycle was not confined to Venice, it is a very Venetian idea. Almost a century before the date of this cycle, a similar, if smaller, series of representations of Trades and Crafts was used by a Venetian sculptor to decorate the bases of the two Piazzetta columns, and a century after the cycle of San Marco this theme was treated once more in the capitals of the Doge's Palace.¹²⁸ During the thirteenth century the organization of the Venetian guilds and corporations was completed. No less than seven *arti* received their elaborate statutes (*capitolari*) at that time.¹²⁹ Venice in this respect led all other Italian cities, in some cases by as much as half a century. How conscious the Venetian guilds were of their dignity and importance, in how self-assured a manner they comported themselves, may be seen from Martino da Canale's vivid description of the homage of the *mestiers* on the occasion of Lorenzo Tiepolo's election to the dogate.¹³⁰ The masters who paid their respects to the newly elected Doge and his lady were: the blacksmiths, the furriers, the tanners, the weavers (of several kinds), the woolspinners and tailors, the shoemakers, the merchants, the vendors of victuals and of fowl, the fishmongers, barbers, glassmakers, combmakers, and goldsmiths. The list is not the same as that of the *mestieri* in the reliefs, but the description and the portrayal sprang from the same newly born interest in matters of everyday life. Whose was the priority in this case, the historian's or the sculptor's, it is difficult to say. In general, da Canale describes things which he has seen either in reality, or in painting and writing; actually, he could have attended the festival and seen the reliefs as well, for they must have been made about the time of his writing.

Not only are the predilection for rendering scenes from daily life and the emphasis on the "arti" typically Venetian; there are specifically Venetian traits in the cycle and within the single scenes. The importance attributed to fishing and shipbuilding is such a trait; another is the combination of the selling of bread with the selling of fish. A few motifs are even specifically "Marcian." This is true, for instance, of the group of the wood-sawers, a motif which seems to have been taken from life itself. In reality, this motif is copied, almost line for line, from the mosaics of the atrium, where it occurs in the story of the

¹²⁸ On the Piazzetta columns see *supra*, p. 117 f. On the capitals of the Doge's Palace: G. Rossi and G. Salerni, *I capitelli*, pp. 73 ff., 79 ff.

¹²⁹ H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*, II, pp. 136 ff., 588 ff. (bibliography); P. Molmenti, *La storia*, I, p. 303 ff.; G. Monticolo, "I capitolari," G. Monticolo and E. Besta, *I capitolari*.

¹³⁰ Martino da Canale, *Chronique*, pp. 604 ff.

Building of the Ark¹³¹—another instance of the susceptibility of the master to inspiration from the mosaics. Other "byzantinisms," if they may be so called, are to be seen in some draperies, or in entire draped figures, like that of the woman buying milk,—a reminiscence of the master's preoccupation with the mosaic figures of the Virtues.

In addition to Byzantine elements, the sculptor also assimilated classical Roman elements. The youthful faces especially show such an intensely Roman cast that it must be assumed that the artist knew and studied Roman portraits, presumably gravestones. One of the most astonishing details in this respect is the head of the cooper's apprentice, the figure on the right side (fig. 81). No less classical, if not so specifically Roman, are some of the draperies (e.g. that of the barber's client). As in contemporary French or, better still, German sculpture, the classical element forms a combination, or rather, a synthesis with the mediaeval. The mediaeval ingredient is a mixture of Romanesque and Gothic, and has the same timeless quality as some of the sculptures of Paris, Rheims, Strasbourg, or Bamberg.¹³² The channel through which the sculptor received these modern, western elements, was perhaps a more direct one than that of the art of Antelami and his followers.

There is little in these reliefs that could be called "Gothic" in the specific sense of the term. The most "Gothic" detail is the drapery of the lame old man. Nevertheless, the whole basis of these sculptures is clearly Gothic. This means that the sculptor shared with the sculptors of the great cathedrals of the thirteenth century a deep interest in realistic traits and the ability to merge these realistic features with elements of an entirely different nature. Never does the beholder have the feeling that any realistic detail comes too much to the foreground because the artist was proud of his "discovery"; everything is in its proper place as part of a truly grand synthesis.

The relief is much deeper and plastically more differentiated than that of the Months or Virtues. Compared with the Crafts, the Months look flat. Within the cycle there are differences: as the work progressed from right to left, from fishing to shipbuilding, the compositions became more complicated. Each of the first four scenes (fishing, smithery, wood-sawing, carpentry), consists of two figures placed side by side in a single plane. In the next scenes a second plane is introduced and the number of figures is augmented. In the last scenes (selling of wine, shipbuilding) there are four different planes with four to five figures.

f. *Front of Third Arch* (figs. 65, 84, 85).¹³³ The prophets (with Christ as the keystone) show an equally excellent workmanship; the scrolls and perforated bosses are, from a technical point of view, perhaps more masterly than anything else in San Marco. From the point of view of iconography, a series of prophets was an integral part of a "cathedral program"; but every effort has been made by the Venetian sculptor to "play down" the iconographic importance of this

¹³¹ S. Bettini, *Mosaici antichi*, pl. LVIII.

¹³² H. von Einem, "Die Monumentalplastik."

¹³³ *La Ducale Basilica, Testò*, p. 253, *Dettagli*, V/3, 172, 172a-c; (=pls. 117-120) H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 205; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 798; R. Jullian, *L'éveil*, p. 295.

part of the façade cycle. The scrolls and bosses are much more in evidence than the comparatively small figures. It is quite clear that the artist wanted to avoid anything that looked like a row of monumental figures. All monumental effect was to be left to the mosaics; the sculptural part had only the function of providing ornate frames. The scrolls and bosses of the archivolt have their nearest parallels in the arch of the Porta dei Fiori (figs. 93, 94), whose figure sculpture we have shown to be a late work of the Heracles Master. In spite of the "family likeness" of the two works, the great archivolt of the central doorway is more spirited in design and detail. However, the two arches are certainly more or less contemporary; both belong to the third quarter of the thirteenth century, and not to the fourteenth century as has often been believed. If there is any small difference in time, the great arch of the west façade is surely the later of the two.

In the reliefs of the front of the great arch there seems to have been reached a final union of the styles and technical methods of the two great workshops active on the façade of San Marco: that of the Heracles Master and that of the central porch. It is, perhaps, permissible to explain this blending by the assumption that the task of the Heracles Master's workshop—the decoration of the side doors—had been finished at the moment when work on the front of the great central arch was begun and that all available forces were then concentrated on finishing the decoration of the main façade. To the style of the outer arch, the workshop of the Heracles Master contributed facial types, draperies, and ornamental motifs consisting of spiral acanthus and bosses, while the deep modelling, the full, vigorous plasticity of the whole work, belonged to the artistic equipment of the Mestieri Master. The arch was, in any case, the crowning achievement of Venetian Ducento sculpture.

The main difference between the workshop of the Heracles Master and that of the central porch lies in the direction in which the development of the two leading artists moved. Both workshops started from similar basic conditions: the soffit of the first arch of the central door is decorated in a manner not too dissimilar from the decoration of the side doors. A very finely chiseled relief of decorative character is set against a flat ground which is not connected with the relief proper by anything providing a transition; the relief is like a kind of grid laid over a flat surface. If in the works of the Heracles Master this seeming lack of connection between ground and pattern is due to contrasts of material and color (mosaic filling), a similar result was brought about in the earliest part of the decoration of the central door by the undercutting of the relief and also, in all likelihood, by the original gilding of the raised part. This gilding is clearly visible in Gentile Bellini's procession panel in the Accademia—though it is, of course, open to question whether the façade's appearance in the thirteenth century was the same as it was in the late fifteenth century.^{133a} Still, the color scheme in Bellini's picture looks very convincing. The gilding is, in fact,

^{133a} According to legend, the gilding of the façade had been decided upon just before Gentile painted his panel, but was never carried out. However, traces still exist which prove that some parts at least were in fact gilt.

the most satisfactory way in which sculpture and mosaic could be brought into unison. If we accept the evidence of the picture, the decor of the central porch was a "coloristic negative" of the color scheme of the side doors: gold on dark here takes the place of dark on gold.

From these beginnings the Heracles Master moved undeviatingly towards an ever-increasing preciousness, while the workshop of the central porch made, so to speak, a new start. After the short-lived interlude of the master who decorated the front of the first arch with the "Gothic putto-genre," the workshop found a new head in the person of the master of the calendar cycle, of the Virtues and of the Trades. He was one of the greatest North Italian sculptors, and in all probability a disciple of Benedetto Antelami. If he did not grow to the stature of his contemporary, Nicolo Pisano, it was due, at least in part, to the fact that Venice had no use for "pure sculpture." All that was expected from him was an elegant decoration in small-scale figures that did not thrust itself into the foreground but remained subordinated to architecture and mosaic.

In spite of these handicaps the Master of the Mestieri, as he may be called, developed in a direction quite different from that of the Heracles Master: he shed some of his early virtuosity in order to cultivate truly plastic qualities. This progress is measured in terms of greater simplicity and grandeur. There must have been a considerable time-lag between the work on the first and on the second of the two arches which are his chief contribution to the decoration of San Marco. Because of its impact on Traù, the calendar cycle must have been made before 1240, probably in the fourth decade of the thirteenth century; the allegories of the Virtues, of which no influence is to be seen in the Traù sculptures, may have been finished about or soon after 1240; but the Crafts and Trades must be a work of the second half of the thirteenth century, possibly the sixties. They would, then, be contemporary with the mature works of the Heracles Master, the arch of the Porta dei Fiori.

The profound, almost antithetic difference between the styles of the Heracles and the Mestieri Masters is, in the last resort, a matter of personal character and equipment. However, outside influences may have had a part in leading them in their respective directions: the Heracles Master took his cue from Byzantine art, while the Mestieri Master started from the early Gothic of Antelami.¹³⁴

3. *Protorenaissance Sculpture.* The three currents of Venetian sculpture that can be classed, roughly, as the Byzantinizing, the Orientalizing and the Antelamesque, were not the only ones that were active in the great decorating campaigns of the thirteenth century. There was yet a fourth movement which was not inspired by contemporary art, Byzantine, Islamic, or Italian, but by Early Christian and Early Byzantine works. Among the looted or imported sculptures were also a number of works of the latter type, and, given the pecu-

¹³⁴ See the excellent characterization of the Venetian development by G. H. Crichton, *Romanesque Sculpture*, p. 89ff.; pertinent remarks may be found also in P. Toesca, *Il Trecento*, p. 400 and *passim*, although the dates proposed by Toesca seem too late. Prof. G. de Francovich has promised a full treatment of Venetian sculpture in the thirteenth century.

liar aptitude of the Venetians for assimilating and copying everything that came within their reach, it would have been strange indeed if the presence of Early Christian spoils had been of no consequence.

As a matter of fact, the Venetians did copy Early Christian works as assiduously as they imitated Byzantine ones. In view of the customary Venetian way of using spoils for the decoration of San Marco, it was almost a matter of course that a workshop should have been established that was able to adapt, mend, and complete damaged spoils and to produce, by copying and imitating, companion pieces. Other Early Christian spoils were simply reworked to make them more palatable to the taste of mediaeval beholders.

As with the Byzantine and Byzantinizing reliefs in San Marco, it is often difficult, in some cases even impossible, to say whether a given work is an original Early Christian sculpture reworked and re-used in the thirteenth century, or a mediaeval imitation. Most of these works were used as tombs, ciborium columns, door lintels, etc., and they form a more or less compact group, all being small-figured, deeply undercut high reliefs in marble or alabaster. There is a certain family likeness between them, even though they are the work of more than one hand and represent widely differing iconographical contents. Some of these seemingly Early Christian works have aroused bitter controversy; others have been neglected. For hardly any of them has a consensus of opinion been reached about their date and provenance. In fact, they are truly embarrassing monuments, often alluded to and argued over but seldom studied critically. Recently, however, Miss Lucchesi-Palli, following a suggestion of Professor Weigand of Munich, published an important study of one of these monuments, the famous columns supporting the ciborium over the high altar of San Marco (figs. 50-55).¹³⁵ Much has been written about this puzzling work: the four columns have been variously dated between the fifth and the thirteenth century, some authors being of the opinion that all were made at one period, while others believed the front pair to be of Early Christian date, the back pair of later mediaeval date. A similar dissension reigns with respect to the provenance of the columns: Ravenna, Dalmatia, Alexandria, Syria, Constantinople, and Venice have been named as places of origin. This is, of course, not the place for a resumé of the controversy, nor even for a critical assessment of Weigand's and Miss Lucchesi-Palli's arguments for a

¹³⁵ Descriptions of the four columns in *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 281 ff.; *Dettagli* V/7, Z. 1-Z. 1d (= pls. 327-327d); A. Venturi, *Storia* I, figs. 219 ff.; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 1 ff. The more recent bibliography, including the crucial paper by E. Weigand, "Zur Datierung," is given by E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*, p. 203 ff. C. R. Morey, "The Early Christian Ivories," p. 52 and note 38, quotes an unpublished study by Messrs Martin, Parkhurst, and Smyth, in which the authors seek to prove that the front pair were brought from Constantinople to Venice in 1204 while the two rear columns were made in Venice in the thirteenth century, when the inscriptions were also added to the scenes on the imported columns. The possibility of separating the two pairs has been considered before, but was strongly contested by various authors, among them Msgr. C. Costantini, "Le colonne," and M. G. Zaccarini, "Le colonne," who advocated a fifth- or sixth-century date for all. This is also the opinion of Prof. C. Anti, "La tomba," while the present author followed Dr. Lucchesi-Palli in two papers (O. Demus, "Frühmittelalterliche Reminiszenzen"; *idem*, "A Renaissance"). However, after Prof. Anti's paper, I should be inclined to suspend judgement on the question whether all four columns were actually made in the thirteenth century or whether two of them only were extensively reworked in that period.

thirteenth-century date of all four columns, arguments which are based primarily on iconographic studies.¹³⁶ Suffice it to say that all four columns must at least have been extensively reworked by an archaizing Venetian workshop, in about the middle of the thirteenth century, so that the present surface certainly belongs to the Ducento. This would explain the curious mixture of oriental and occidental motifs, of Early Christian and later mediaeval details, the medley of Hellenism, Byzantinism, and provincialism.¹³⁷

To prove his hypothesis of a thirteenth-century date for all columns, Weigand pointed to the late form of the High Priest's headgear in the left rear column, to the un-antique types of ships, thrones, and crowns, and to iconographical schemes which are rather Western and mediaeval than Early Christian and Byzantine (Miracle at Cana, Lazarus, Last Supper, etc.). While Weigand based his arguments mainly on the back pair, Miss Lucchesi-Palli concentrated her very detailed study on the right front column, analyzing the scenes of Christ's Passion and Resurrection mainly from the iconographical point of view. It is difficult to refute her plausible arguments, culminating in the statement that certain scenes of the cycle do not occur in Early Christian or Early Byzantine monuments; that certain motifs are not to be found before the thirteenth century; and that other traits point to a time after 1200.¹³⁸ This, in conjunction with the fact that there is a strong North Italian component in the iconographic and stylistic make-up of the columns, a component which is stronger than the Early Christian or the Byzantine, convinced Miss Lucchesi-Palli of the Venetian origin of the monument, since only in Venice could these different components be expected to enter into such an intimate symbiosis.

Even if it is assumed that Miss Lucchesi-Palli is mistaken and that those authors who dated the front pair (figs. 52-55) of columns in the sixth century are correct, there remains the back pair (figs. 50, 51). These have been dated by most authors in the thirteenth century, and disregarded by those who uphold an Early Christian date for the front pair. As a matter of fact, the only way to save the Early Christian hypothesis for the back pair is to assume that it was thoroughly reworked by a Venetian sculptor of the thirteenth century and that the inscriptions were also added at that time; such a conclusion is inevitable, in view of the many mediaevalisms in the style of these columns. But looking again at the front pair one finds that they contain hardly fewer mediaeval traits, although these are less obvious because of the more "classical" cast of their style. Some drapery motifs, especially those round the knees of figures wearing togas, the treatment of the angels' wings, and also a number of the faces cannot be regarded as anything but mediaeval. The nearest parallels of this mediaeval style are as close to hand as can be: they are the seated figures of Christ and the evangelists which at present are placed on the roof of the ciborium

¹³⁶ Miss Lucchesi-Palli's book was reviewed by the late A. M. Schneider, who fully agreed with the proposed thirteenth-century date for all four columns; see *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLII (1943-1949), p. 276 ff.

¹³⁷ This has already been pointed out by E. Baldwin Smith, *Early Christian Iconography*, *passim*.

¹³⁸ The details which point to a thirteenth-century date have been listed by Miss Lucchesi-Palli in a resumé contained in pp. 139-148 of her book.

itself (fig. 64).¹³⁹ A comparison of any one of these seated figures with, for instance, the figure of Christ enthroned in majesty in the top compartment of the right-hand front column, leaves no doubt as to their close relationship (fig. 53).

The chief artist who, we may assume, thoroughly reworked—if he did no more—the reliefs of the four ciborium columns, was the head of a workshop whose activities can still be traced in various places in San Marco. In the main, this workshop was devoted to “repairs” and restorations, but it also created quite a number of original works in “Early Christian” styles.

Quite close in style to the surface treatment of the ciborium columns and to the seated evangelists is a marble tondo with a seated apostle (Saint Mark?) which has found its way (via Catajo) into the Este collection of Vienna.¹⁴⁰ The folds have the same lava-like character as those of the seated statues on the roof of the ciborium. Slightly more classical in features, proportions, and draperies are the two reliefs of standing apostles, at present set into the north façade of the church, in the lintel of the Porta dei Fiori (fig. 91).¹⁴¹ It is possible that they may originally have belonged to the decor of the high altar. Both works seem to be copies or adaptations of Early Christian prototypes. Of a more elusive character are the reliefs of the lintel of the Porta Sant’Alipio, the left doorway of the west façade (figs. 88, 56).¹⁴² They consist of eleven pieces which were arranged differently at different periods, so that it is impossible in their present location to determine the order in which they were set in the thirteenth century. They were certainly in their present place at the end of the fifteenth century since they figure in Gentile Bellini’s rendering of the façade; (fig. 9); and one part of them seems to have been meant for the decoration of the lintel from the very beginning. The end-piece on the left appears to be in its original place, since the irregularly inclined pillar that frames it on the left-hand side fits exactly the slant of the adjoining architrave. Miss Lucchesi-Palli concludes from this that at least this part of the relief was expressly made for its position. As the Porta Sant’Alipio received its decor in the third quarter of the thirteenth century, in the fifties or sixties, the left end-piece must have been made at that time. This piece with the standing figure of a priest carrying a *turibulum* (censer) differs in no way from the end-piece on the right-hand side, and the heads of the two figures—to say nothing of the framing pillars—match the bearded heads of other figures of the lintel so closely that it is difficult to imagine that the various pieces belong to different hands or periods.

¹³⁹ These figures (*La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 138 a, figs. a–e) were *in situ* at least as early as 1690. Cf. the ceremonial picture, *ibid.*, *Documenti*, pl. XXXI, fig. 109, where there are eight figures. For the figures themselves, see *infra*, p. 184.

¹⁴⁰ L. Planiscig, *Die Estensische Kunstsammlung*, I, p. 8, no. 14, fig. 14. E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*, p. 198 ff., note 435, pl. VIII a; O. Demus, “A Renaissance,” p. 350.

¹⁴¹ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/1, 39 (= pl. 28); E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*, p. 199, note 437, pl. VIII b; O. Demus, “A Renaissance,” p. 350.

¹⁴² *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 296; *Dettagli* V/2, 89, 89 a (= pls. 57, 57 a); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 83 ff.; A. Venturi, *Storia*, III, p. 101. Analysis and bibliography in E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*, p. 153 ff., note 29, with arguments for a date in the thirteenth century; see also *ibid.*, pl. VII a, c; O. Demus, “A Renaissance,” p. 350. None of the authors listed above (myself included) observed that at least part of the reliefs belonged originally to a curved object, a fact which was first pointed out by Professor H. R. Hahnloser.

Nevertheless, there are elements in the cycle which it would be hard to explain if it were assumed that all eleven pieces were made to order for their present emplacement. To begin with, the cycle does not make sense iconographically. Two priests (Levites) with censers guard the two ends. Interspersed between scenic representations there are: Christ with St. Peter and Paul and four single, bearded figures of evangelists in niches, as well as five figures of apostles in a row. These figures, odd as their distribution is, might still represent a complete cycle of Christ, the evangelists, and the apostles, although it would be more logical to assume that there was, originally, another group of five apostles in a row and that the four evangelists were represented separately and not counted as belonging to the cycle of apostles. The true difficulty begins, however, with the Gospel scenes. Their sequence (Annunciation to the Shepherds, Adoration of the Magi, and Miracle of Cana) can by no means be regarded as a self-contained cycle. They can only be fragments or remnants of a larger ensemble, or, at best, the beginning of a cycle. Moreover, one of the three scenes, the Annunciation to the Shepherds, requires a continuation on its left. This scene cannot be complete, since it includes the Child in the manger, flanked by the ox and the ass, but neither the Virgin nor St. Joseph; these latter must have been represented in the adjoining compartment.

Thus we are faced with a complicated situation. On the one hand, the lintel contains parts which seem to have been made expressly for their respective places, namely, the end-pieces with the two Levites framed by ornamented pillars. On the other hand, there are parts which were obviously taken from another, larger, context, namely, the three scenic representations and possibly also the groups and single figures of Christ, the evangelists, and the apostles. It is, furthermore, possible to state that some of these reliefs were originally attached to a curved surface, since the larger scenic reliefs are unmistakably convex.

Two different sets of solutions, or variants of them, seem to fit these facts equally well. The first is a clear distinction between the end-pieces on the one hand and the scenic reliefs on the other, whereby the former would have to be dated in the thirteenth century, while the latter would have to be considered as earlier, that is, Early Christian. In adopting this solution we would have to assume that, as in the case of the façade icons, the Venetians had a number of spoils at their disposal. These consisted of the three scenes which they used for the revetment of the lintel. Since the spoils, put together, fell short of the entire length of the lintel, the resulting space was then filled with reliefs created for this express purpose or with other reworked spoils. An argument in favor of this solution might be found in the fact that the end-plaques show a slightly different kind of treatment from the other reliefs as regards the drapery of the figures and the ornamentation of the architectural framework. If this solution is adopted, or, at least, seriously considered, we must ask ourselves whether the series of standing figures of Christ, the apostles, and the evangelists agree with the work of the thirteenth century (i.e. the end-pieces) or with the earlier carvings. Their asymmetry and the seeming incompleteness suggest that they, too, were spoils, incorporated by the thirteenth-century decorator into the new

ensemble. That they show a style somewhat different from that of the scenic representations is not a serious objection. They might stem from a different source, even from a different period, the only common denominator being that they also were spoils. More serious is the observation that all the pieces show the same scheme of drapery and the same facial characteristics. This lack of imagination would be unusual for an Early Christian sculptor, but would be explainable in the work of a later copyist or restorer. But the weightiest piece of evidence is that the faces of these eleven figures seem to have been cast from the same mould, so to speak, as were the heads of the two thirteenth-century end figures. This means that they are either thirteenth-century works themselves, or were completely reworked at the time when the end figures were made.

The second possibility is to regard all reliefs as works of the thirteenth century. In this case we should have to assume that the original cycle was considerably larger and that it was spread over two or three doors. Such an assumption would be quite reasonable, owing to the fact that the second and fourth doors (counted from either side) were materially altered by the insertion of Gothic windows in the Trecento, an alteration in the course of which the lintels of these doors could have been removed and partly destroyed. The extant reliefs of the Porta Sant'Alipio would in this case be the remnants of two or three lintels set side by side with little respect for the original program.

Confronted with this alternative, we are inclined to give preference to the first possibility, especially in view of the curvature of the narrative reliefs. Thus we see in the lintel the remnants of an Early Christian work, restored, reworked, and completed in the thirteenth century. It is the extensive reworking which makes it well-nigh impossible to establish the real date of each single piece.

Equally controversial is the sarcophagus of Doge Marino Morosini in the north wing of the atrium (fig. 58). As has been pointed out by Gombosi,¹⁴³ Morosini, who died in 1253, probably owed his burial in San Marco to his active share in the building of the north wing of the atrium, where his sepulchre stands. The sarcophagus is not made of one piece, in the manner of a trough, but consists of several parts; a two-storied front and two sides, all of different materials and workmanship, are welded together by richly profiled frames of red Veronese marble. The front part is divided into two registers by a flat band which bears the inscription: HIC REQVIESIT DNS MARINVS MOROCEN^s DVX. The upper register shows Christ and the twelve apostles in more or less frontal attitudes, the lower register six orant figures with gigantic censers between them. The major part of this two-storied front consists of a single piece of marble probably of Greek origin. In addition, there are two pieces at the sides forming the vertical frames, and three minor pieces of various materials. These technical facts are, so Professor Anti claims, sufficient to prove that the major part of the front was an earlier piece which was

¹⁴³ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 295; *Dettagli*, V/5, F. 1 (= pl. 204); E. Weigand, "Zur Datierung," p. 451; E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*, p. 199, note 436, pl. IX; O. Demus, "A Renaissance," p. 351; C. Anti, "La tomba"; G. Gombosi, "Il portico."

completed and restored in order to serve as the "façade" of the thirteenth-century sarcophagus. The vertical parts of the vegetal frame, made after the model of the old, horizontal parts, show quite clearly a somewhat different technique; they are flatter, less plastic, and less organic. At the left the addition also embraces a part of the last figure in the top row.

These additions and repairs are not, however, the only manipulations which the presumed Early Christian sarcophagus front underwent in the course of being reshaped for the Doge's tomb. If we are to believe in the Early Christian date of the relief, its figures must have been reworked too. In particular the draperies of the orant figures in the lower register, not to mention the censers, would be difficult to accept as authentically "Early Christian," at least in the shape in which they present themselves now. It must be supposed that the whole relief was extensively reworked. Indeed, no part of the present surface could be called Early Christian.

The side pieces are spoils of two different kinds. The left side is a Byzantine relief showing a "leaved cross," a motif which occurs from the sixth to the fourteenth century; its particular shape points to a relatively advanced period, perhaps the ninth or the tenth century. The right part, interpreted by Professor Anti as a *mensa martyrum*, may be a good deal earlier, possibly of the fifth century. The whole is a pasticcio, the main interest of which lies in the fact that the Venetians of the mid-thirteenth century could think of no greater sepulchral honor for their deceased Doge than to bury him in a sarcophagus that looked Early Christian, but was actually concocted from various bits and pieces and furbished up so as to become presentable.¹⁴⁴

Even more interesting is a relief which, like the upper register of the Morosini sarcophagus, shows Christ and the twelve apostles, and which is at present set into a wall of the Cappella delle Reliquie in the Tesoro of San Marco (fig. 57).¹⁴⁵ The theme is the Early Christian one of the *Traditio legis*, with one of the apostles, usually St. Peter or St. Paul, approaching Christ, who stands in a columnar niche in the center, and receives the "Law" into his outstretched hands. The Venetian relief, however, fits into none of the well-known groups of sarcophagi depicting this subject and is usually considered mediaeval by archaeologists dealing with Early Christian art, while mediaevalists regard it as Early Christian. Actually, it is, again, either a completely reworked Early Christian piece, or, more likely, a thirteenth-century copy after one or more Early Christian originals. The primary source of inspiration would have been, in the latter case, a Constantinopolitan relief, perhaps known to the

¹⁴⁴ C. Anti, "La tomba," p. 20. I still doubt whether Prof. Anti's identification of the right side as a *mensa martyrum* is correct. For the left side see D. T. Rice, "The Leaved Cross."

¹⁴⁵ A. Pasini, *Il tesoro*, p. 93; O. Mothes, *Geschichte*, I, p. 96f. (who dates it in the second century!); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 146 (mediaeval imitation of Early Christian prototype); E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endszenen*, p. 156, note 31 (thirteenth century, after Early Christian model); O. Demus, "A Renaissance," p. 351 (ditto); L. Coletti, "Intorno," p. 76 (ditto). Christian archaeologists, such as J. Wilpert (*I sarcofagi*), G. Bovini (*I sarcofagi*), H. Dütschke (*Raven-natische Studien*), H. U. v. Schoenebeck (*Der Mailänder Sarkophag*) do not consider this relief as Early Christian, whereas the mediaevalists P. Toesca (*Storia* I, p. 897, note 38) and G. Marzemin (*Le origini*, p. 252) regard it as an Early Christian work of the fifth century. Here is a typical case of scholars attempting to shift responsibility away from themselves.

Venetians in a fragmentary state, a relief such as the fine "Traditio" in the Istanbul Museum. But the Venetian sculptor seems also to have known and copied a piece nearer at hand, namely the sarcophagus of San Ambrogio in Milan, the side reliefs of which could have provided the models for several figures of the Venetian work. In fact, the artist seems to have come from Lombardy or Verona. If the archaism of the Venetian relief is discounted, the nearest stylistic parallels are the figures of the apostles from the Pontile of San Zeno in Verona and the enthroned Christ in the Cathedral of Treviso. A good parallel is also to be found in the reworked Early Christian sarcophagus in Mantua Cathedral.¹⁴⁶

The "Traditio" is of high quality, even if it is a hybrid work. The mediaeval character of the surface is unmistakable in the expression of the faces, the curious tension of the attitudes, the manner in which the heads are planted on the long necks, the linear design of hair and beards, the knife-like sharpness of the linear draperies, and the undulating seams. The present position of the relief is, of course, a secondary one; originally it may have been the *stipes* of one of the altars, possibly even the high altar. In this case it is not unlikely that the artist or restorer had intended to change the iconographic meaning of his prototype and to represent not the *traditio legis* but Saint Mark presenting his Gospel to the Saviour. If this is so, the attempt has failed, since the type of the apostle with the book in his hand is not that of the evangelist, but has remained that of St. Paul as in a number of Early Christian examples.

In the Cappella delle Reliquie there is another relief which is set into the wall immediately above the "Traditio."¹⁴⁷ Its motif, a laurel wreath with the figure of Christ held by two flying angels above a "mountain" with the four Rivers of Paradise (fig. 59), is set against a smooth back ground in a way that is reminiscent of fifth-century Byzantine sarcophagi; but the proportions are different and the style is not that of the fifth century. The garland of leaves which frames the upper edge of the relief is exactly the same as in the "Traditio," and the angels' draperies, now gilded and painted, show something of the sharpness of those of the apostles. As this panel is smaller, it may have served to decorate the *stipes* of a side altar, or it may have been originally a funerary relief. In support of this function we may quote one of

¹⁴⁶ For the "Traditio" relief in the Istanbul Museum, see J. Kollwitz, *Oströmische Plastik*, pl. 48. The iconography of the Milan Sarcophagus is studied by F. Gerke, "Das Verhältnis." A. Katzenellenbogen, "The Sarcophagus" (with bibliography), regards the Milan sarcophagus as the tomb of St. Ambrose himself, which would explain the great influence that it exerted not only in Early Christian but also in mediaeval times. The figure of Abraham (in the sacrifice of Isaac) on the Milan sarcophagus (reprod. by J. Wilpert, *I sarcofagi*, pl. CLXXXIX) corresponds exactly to the St. Peter of the Venetian relief; the figure to the right of Abraham seems to have furnished the model for the second figure from the right in Venice; the attitudes of the last figures to the right in Milan and Venice are identical.

The apostles of the Pontile of San Zeno are treated at length by G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, pp. 85, 90, 106, 465. *Idem*, "Contributi," p. 116 ff., fig. 19 ff.; A. Kingsley Porter, *Lombard Architecture*, III, p. 527, erroneously regarded them as forgeries of the nineteenth century. E. Arslan, *La pittura*, correctly dates the figures to about 1240. On the Treviso Christ see H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 199 ff. and L. Coletti, "Intorno." The reworking of the Mantua sarcophagus forms the subject of a study by M. Lawrence ("A Gothic Reworking").

¹⁴⁷ A. Pasini, *Il tesoro*, p. 5. The prototype may have been a Constantinopolitan relief like those published by J. Kollwitz, *Oströmische Plastik*, p. 134 and p. 45.

several variants of this type, namely the funerary relief of Doge Raniero Zeno (died 1268) in SS. Giovanni e Paolo. Other reliefs of Christ borne by flying angels have been preserved in Venice (Frari), Padua, and Vienna. The one in Padua, of the early fourteenth century, forms the front of the sarcophagus of the Negri family, in the Santo. This sarcophagus is in its entirety the work of one master who developed the pattern of the Cappella delle Reliquie relief along the lines of Gothic-Byzantine sculpture. Eagles, an equestrian portrait, and busts of saints (the latter in the acroteria) complete the decor of the sarcophagus whose sculptor was also active in San Marco. The altar relief of the Cappella San Pietro is, if not a work of his hand, at least a product of his workshop.¹⁴⁸

Another relief that reproduces Early Christian motifs, although it does not duplicate an Early Christian original, is a plaque, now set into the north façade of San Marco, which shows the Hetoimasia topped by a medallion with the Lamb and flanked on either side by six lambs and a palm tree (fig. 60). It forms part of an arrangement in which roundels with fighting animals, jambs of ambostairs, and transenna panels are grouped together to decorate one of the bays of the north façade. This decorative arrangement is certainly of the thirteenth century. However, the parts of the ensemble are older, most of them being spoils. The relief with the lambs has usually been considered a sixth-century work. But in its present form it must be regarded as a mediaeval work to which the thirteenth century made an important contribution. But it cannot be regarded as an original work of the thirteenth century: the hardness of the forms and the dryness of the composition point to an earlier period, perhaps the eleventh century. Indeed, it is likely that this relief belonged to the church of the eleventh century. The pseudo-Byzantine character, the Greek inscriptions, and the subject matter (the lambs are designated by the inscription as the apostles) would point to this conclusion, as well as would the fact that the same subject is also found in a frieze at Saint-Front in Périgueux, a church copied after San Marco. The thirteenth-century decorators restored the relief and gave it its prominent position as the center of a decorative arrangement which consists in the main of Early Byzantine spoils.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁸ The funeral relief of Ranieri Zeno in SS. Giovanni e Paolo, the one in the Frari (first cloisters), and the two in S. Antonio, Padua, are briefly described by H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 249; payments for the Zeno sepulchre are recorded in B. Cecchetti, "Nomi," p. 46. The Vienna relief (Estensische Kunstsammlung, now Kunsthistorisches Museum), a work of very high quality, belongs to the fourteenth century; for this relief see L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 38 ff. (with a date in the second half of the thirteenth century), fig. 12; together with two smaller reliefs (*ibid.*, figs. 13, 14) it seems to have formed the *stipes* decoration of an altar (see also L. Planiscig, *Die Estensische Kunstsammlung*, I, p. 15, no. 25). The sarcophagus of the Negri family has been recently photographed by the Soprintendenza ai Monumenti Medioevali e Moderni in Venice (Photo Candio nos. 13887-13890). I am greatly indebted to Ispettore Dott. M. Muraro for prints.

For the composition of the enthroned Christ, flanked by two angels, see also the Munich Cameo, *infra*, p. 176, note 158.

¹⁴⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 257 ff., *Dettagli*, V/1, 68 (= pl. 44) (sixth century); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 125 ff. (about A.D. 700); L. Bréhier, "Études," p. 25 (sixth century). G. Musolino, *La Basilica*, p. 73 and fig. 39 (tenth century). The presence of the same subject in a frieze in Saint-Front has been pointed out by F. de Verneilh, "Des influences," p. 234 ff., plate opposite p. 233.

A relief on the north façade, on the other hand, which shows the Sacrifice of Isaac in two scenes (fig. 62), must be regarded as a work of the thirteenth century. Of course, the composition is not an invention of a sculptor of that period, but was copied from an Early Christian original. It is a product of a workshop whose style presents a curious mixture of archaisms and Gothicisms.¹⁵⁰

In other works, the Early Christian elements are blended with Byzantine, Romanesque, or classical traits.

One of the finest Venetian adaptations of an Early Byzantine prototype is the figure of an angel, with staff and orb, on the south façade, which was copied from an imported piece, namely from a damaged and reworked relief in the Cappella Zeno.¹⁵¹ It is not a slavish copy, since the position of the angel's left hand has been altered; the most characteristic difference, however, lies in the sophisticated expression of the face and in the intricacy of the drapery pattern. More complicated problems are raised by the relief with the Nativity in the Cappella Zeno (fig. 61) and its companion piece with the Flight to Egypt in Berlin.¹⁵² It is astonishing that an otherwise critical scholar like Von der Gabelentz should have attributed this relief (which he connects with the Nativity in S. Giovanni Elemosinario) to the Early Byzantine period; for the Romanesque features of the work are hardly at all disguised, so that it cannot even be called a successful imitation of an Early Byzantine model. The lost prototype may have been a work like the fragment of a relief in the Byzantine Museum at Athens,¹⁵³ which combined the Flight to Egypt with the Nativity, as does the relief of San Marco. The comparison with the Athens relief (which comes from Naxos) brings out the mediaeval, indeed Romanesque, character of the Venetian work. This character has been recognized by A. S. Keck, who regards this work as a typical product of an Italo-Byzantine school of sculpture, and especially of ivory carving, active in Venice in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.¹⁵⁴ Dr. Keck's hypothesis is extremely plausible, although more specialized work will be necessary before it can be regarded as proven. Perhaps one may even extend it to include another province of the realm of the minor arts, namely gem cutting.

So far, the share of mediaeval Venice in the development of gem and cameo cutting has not been adequately appreciated, perhaps because the discovery of mediaeval gem manufacture in general is a rather recent achievement. No consensus has been reached up to now as to which groups of gems or which

¹⁵⁰ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 271 (sixth century) *Dettagli*, V/1 56 (= pl. 37); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 213 (fourteenth century).

¹⁵¹ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 139 ff. The Early Byzantine relief in the Cappella Zeno (*ibid.*, fig. 6), must have been of an especially high quality before it was rather clumsily restored, probably in the thirteenth century. The copy on the south façade is reproduced in *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V, pls. 114, 166.

¹⁵² *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/5, 1.8 (= pl. 216); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 147 ff: "frühbyzantinisch." Thus also G. Swarzenski, in his review of Gabelentz' book, in *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* (Vienna, 1904), p. 42. P. Toesca, *Storia I*, p. 896, note 35, rightly points out the Romanesque traits of the relief. The relief in San Giovanni Elemosinario, on the other hand (H. Von der Gabelentz, *op. cit.*, fig. 11), must be regarded as Byzantine: O. Wulff, *Altchristliche und Byzantinische Kunst*, p. 131; *idem*, "Ein Gang," p. 226. On the related relief in Berlin see O. Wulff, *Mittelalterliche Bildwerke*, second ed., p. 46 ff., no. 6364.

¹⁵³ J. Kollwitz, *Oströmische Plastik*, p. 184 ff., pl. 54: fifth century.

¹⁵⁴ A. S. Keck, "A Group," p. 156.

individual pieces should be regarded as mediaeval, as against their customary dating in the classical or Renaissance periods. We know that antique gems were among the most highly valued objects throughout the Middle Ages, not only for their material value and magical properties, but also for their often misunderstood subject matter, as nearly all the classical subjects represented on them were re-interpreted in a Christian sense. Since genuine antique gems became increasingly rare, especially from the thirteenth century onwards, there developed a flourishing industry for imitating antique cameos, or, at least, for producing gems in the "antique manner." But the study of these problems is still in an embryonic stage and even those authors who concur in regarding certain groups of cameos as mediaeval, have not yet been able to agree about their places of origin and their dates.¹⁵⁵ So far only a small number of gems and cameos has been connected with Venice. These are copies, or casts in glass paste, of Byzantine originals, or works which show very strong Byzantine influence, as, for instance, the two green jasper cameos of the Berne diptych produced in the nineties of the thirteenth century. From these examples we definitely know that there were workshops in Venice in which cameos were cut in the Byzantine style, and it is quite likely that the influence of these workshops was active as late as the Quattrocento.¹⁵⁶ However, as there existed more than one trend or current in Venetian thirteenth-century sculpture in general, it is most probable that Venetian gem cutters, too, worked in several different styles and that gems were made in Venice which provided on a smaller scale parallels to the protorenaissance sculpture discussed in this chapter. As a matter of fact, there exist a fair number of mediaeval cameos that represent Christian subjects and that, as regards their style, show no affinities with mediaeval Byzantine art, but copy, more or less successfully, Early Christian gems. These curious objects form, generally speaking, two large groups. One of them, first collected and interpreted by Schlunk, imitates oriental gems of the sixth century in a technique that is reminiscent of Sassanian gem cutting; the other, studied by Wentzel in various papers, follows classical or late antique prototypes. These cameos are not copies but mediaeval inventions made in imitation of older styles. Neither of the two groups can be localized with certainty. While the first has been tentatively connected with northwestern Europe, the second has been regarded as French, South Italian, or Sicilian, with a strong presumption in favor of the court art of Frederick II in Apulia.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ For the problem in general, see J. Evans, *A History*; *idem*, *Magical Jewels*; W. S. Heckscher, "Relics"; U. T. Holmes, "Mediaeval Gem Stones"; H. Wentzel, "Mittelalterliche Gemmen"; *idem*, "Mittelalter und Antike"; H. Ladendorf, "Antikenstudium," pp. 17, 51 ff.

¹⁵⁶ On glass imitations of antique gems in Venice: H. Wentzel, "Mittelalterliche Gemmen," pp. 58 ff. 85 ff. and O. Wulff, *Altchristliche . . . Bildwerke*, second edit. p. 127 ff.; on the acknowledged Venetian thirteenth-century school of gem cutting, see E. Maurer, *Die Kunstdenkmäler*, pp. 255 ff. esp. 260 ff. 274 ff; figs. 233, 234 (the Berne diptych); in addition one might claim as Venetian the Cleveland Nativity (W. M. Milliken, "Exhibition," p. 227; J. Evans, *A History*, pl. 33a) and the Vienna Crucifixion (F. Eichler und E. Kris, *Die Kameen*, no. 145), which is of relatively late date.

¹⁵⁷ H. Schlunk, "Eine Gemme"; H. Wentzel, "Eine Kamee"; *idem*, "Die grosse Kamee"; *idem*, "Der Augustalis." Prof. Wentzel regards most of the cameos of this group as South Italian works of the thirteenth century, while J. Deér, "Die Basler Löwenkameen," attempts to differentiate between Siculo-Norman gems of the twelfth century and South Italian (Frederician) ones of the thirteenth century.

Among the finest works belonging to the second group there are some which show undeniable affinities with Venetian sculpture of the thirteenth century. Professor Wentzel has himself noticed these affinities, although he did not consider the possibility of the Venetian origin of these gems. Perhaps the most impressive of these mediaeval cameos in the Early Christian style which show stylistic affinities with Venetian works, are two oval cameos with an enthroned youthful figure in frontal attitude, being crowned with a wreath or diadem by two winged angels. These gems may be compared with the panel of the *Cappella delle Reliquie*, the one showing two angels carrying the youthful Christ, as well as with the Virtues of the central portal of San Marco. As none of the figures on the two cameos appears to have a halo,^{157a} Wentzel thought it possible that the enthroned person was meant to represent not Christ but a temporal ruler—perhaps Frederick II—and regarded a South Italian origin as most likely. This secular interpretation must seem extremely doubtful, since some details, like the clouds on which the angels stand, indicate a celestial scene. No doubt can exist, however, concerning the thirteenth-century date of the two cameos. Their stylistic language is clearly mediaeval, although the two different artists who created these cameos aimed at producing the effect of Early Christian or Early Byzantine works. This is true not only as regards their composition, which is reminiscent of the relief in the *Cappella delle Reliquie* and its descendants, but also as regards their classical style.

Now, this Christian classicism is exactly the quality one would expect from a Venetian workshop active about the middle of the thirteenth century in close proximity to a workshop of protorenaissance sculpture. Nor are the Munich and Paris "coronation" cameos the only examples that exhibit this quality. They share their mediaeval-Christian subject matter and their Early Christian (or late antique) style with a number of other cameos. Among these is an interesting group characterized by Old Testament subjects and Hebrew inscriptions. The finest examples in this group are the Noah cameo in Paris, the Ascension of Elijah in London, the Joseph gem in Leningrad, and the Brazen Serpent, also in the Hermitage.¹⁵⁸ Wentzel, who dedicated two of his penetrating studies to this group, regarded them as *bibelots* ("Kunstkammerstücke"), made in thirteenth-century Italy for princely patrons. This is quite likely, but it still remains to be ascertained in which Italian center these cameos originated. Since we know that Venice was a very active center of the crafts of goldsmiths, crystal workers, and gem cutters, it is not unlikely that the "Early Christian" fashion in mediaeval cameo cutting was created in this city whose artists had, to a higher degree than others, developed both taste and ability for creating works in this style.¹⁵⁹

^{157a} A recent cleaning of the Paris cameo showed that the figure of Christ does have a halo.

¹⁵⁸ H. Wentzel, "Die Münchener Christuskamee"; *idem* "Die grosse Kamee" (esp. fig. 38f.). The old Testament cameos have been collected by Prof. Wentzel in his paper "Eine Kamee" (with bibliography).

¹⁵⁹ Prof. H. R. Hahnloser of Berne is preparing a work on Venetian crystal cutting. See, in the meantime, H. R. Hahnloser, *Opus*.

This archaizing current, or, as it might be called, the Early Christian fashion, can be detected also in much of the purely decorative sculpture of San Marco; witness, for instance, three pairs of impost capitals in the north wing of the atrium, which were expressly made for their present location and serve to uphold the arches on the walls of the church. On the other hand, the capitals in the corners, next to the Porta della Madonna and the "Angolo di Sant'Alipio," are originals of the early sixth century and were restored only in the thirteenth century. The small capitals of the colonnettes of the Porta della Madonna itself, which were made in the second half of the thirteenth century, together with the entire portal, are free imitations of Early Byzantine basket capitals. In fact, the capitals of San Marco, especially those of the atrium and the façade, run the whole gamut from the untouched originals of classical, Early Christian, or Byzantine workmanship to free interpretations of the same types, some of which already bear the stamp of incipient Gothic. This gamut includes, as intermediate stages, spoils restored and altered in varying degrees as well as close copies and imitations of early originals; the same range of possibilities as in the sculptured reliefs in and outside San Marco.¹⁶⁰

The sarcophagi of this period would deserve a special chapter. It seems to have become almost *de rigueur* in the second half of the thirteenth and the first half of the fourteenth century to use, for the burials of the great, sarcophagi which were either early Christian or which resembled Early Christian and Early Byzantine sepulchres so closely that they could be mistaken for such to this very day. A good example is the sarcophagus, on the façade of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, of Doges Giacomo and Lorenzo Tiepolo, father and son, who died in 1249 and in 1275, respectively. The work is so far removed from normal thirteenth-century sarcophagi that an early mediaeval date has usually been ascribed to it; it was impossible to class it as Early Christian in the specific sense of that term because of the barbarous and almost shapeless figure relief. But the seventh-century date which has been proposed does not fit the sarcophagus either. The mouldings, cornices, etc., are not early mediaeval, nor can a date other than the thirteenth century be upheld because of the armorial bearings which are carved in high relief. Thus, the entire sculptural treatment must be ascribed to the thirteenth century, while the "raw material," the sarcophagus itself in its unadorned shape, may have been an Early Christian one like those frequently found even today in the neighborhood of the lagoons, especially in Concordia, Aquileia, or Grado.¹⁶¹

A more complicated problem is presented by the sarcophagus of the Bebi family in the cloister of S. Antonio in Padua. It is to all intents and purposes a falsification of an Early Byzantine sarcophagus of the "Ravenna-type," except that old parts seem to have been used in it to give it an authentic appearance.

¹⁶⁰ The capitals of San Marco will be the object of a study by Prof. F. W. Deichmann, Rome, to whom I am obliged for advice in this connection; in the meantime, see G. Mariacher, "Capitelli," and E. Kitzinger, "The Horse and Lion Tapestry," p. 61 ff.

¹⁶¹ R. Cattaneo, *L'architettura*, p. 63 ff., fig. 16; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik* p. 68 (with a date in the seventh century). For the basic shape see G. Brusin, *Nuovi monumenti*, figs. 21, 25; P. L. Zovatto, "Antichi monumenti," figs. 2, 7.

It is provided with a richly moulded base below and a boldly projecting cornice with acanthus leaves above. The three carved sides are made up of several pieces; those constituting the front and the right side may be ancient, but their surface must have been worked over very drastically to have produced such incongruous forms as the angular "mountains" on which stand the lambs and from which issue not four but two "rivers of Paradise" shaped so oddly as to be hardly recognizable. It is not only some of the details that are odd; the composition as a whole has no parallels in genuine Ravenna sarcophagi. The arcading of the front is interrupted in the center by a medallion with a shell against which the Lamb of God is outlined. The left side on which the semicircular arches containing shells make way for Gothic arches is certainly a mediaeval addition. The corner columns, too, must have been made, or at least reworked in the early fourteenth century; their bases are decorated with four tiny spirals which correspond to Romanesque corner leaves, but are translated into the likeness of spiral volutes. In short, so much is "wrong" with the sarcophagus from the Early Byzantine point of view that there arises the question whether the whole is not made up of copied or faked parts rather than of authentic remains. The fact that the sarcophagus consists of several pieces need not weigh too heavily, because other sarcophagi in the same locale which do not pretend to be anything but straightforward Gothic works are likewise pieced together of separate plaques—a technical procedure which was apparently the rule in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Such Gothic sarcophagi likewise have corner spirals on the bases of columns, an odd and very characteristic detail which is found again in San Marco. It occurs there in the bases of the spiral columns which are part of the Gothic windows above the second and the fourth side doors of the west façade.¹⁶²

Another highly interesting sarcophagus of the kind under review, also at the Santo in Padua, is that of Guido da Lozzo.¹⁶³ If the motifs of the Bebi sarcophagus were taken from fifth-century Ravenna sarcophagi, those which decorate the front and sides of the da Lozzo sepulchre resemble early mediaeval forms of a somewhat later phase. The late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century stone mason, who betrayed himself by using dentils and other details, did not, of course, deliberately choose in this case to imitate mediaeval instead of Early Christian or Early Byzantine work. The essential thing for him was the archaic character of the decor with its wreath, Chrismata, vases, vines, and eagles connoting Early Christian symbolism.

These and other sarcophagi¹⁶⁴ are nothing but "Ersatz" for genuine Early

¹⁶² On the Bebi sarcophagus see A. Venturi, *Storia*, I, p. 441, fig. 208; S. Bettini, "Padova," p. 236, fig. 11 ff.; M. Lawrence, "The Sarcophagi," p. 38 ff., figs. 58, 66.

¹⁶³ A. Venturi, *Storia*, I, p. 442, fig. 216; S. Bettini, *Padova*, p. 255 ff., figs. 26, 27, with bibliography.

¹⁶⁴ Early Christian or Early Byzantine elements occur in many mediaeval sarcophagi of Venetia: see, for example, on the exterior south wall of SS. Giovanni e Paolo, the graves decorated with crosses and framed with dentils and columns (first half of the fourteenth century); one of the della Torre sarcophagi of Aquileia: *La Basilica di Aquileia*, pl. 88; the sarcophagus in the Municipio of Ostiglia, Province of Mantua: *Inventario*, Provincia di Mantova (1935), p. 125, etc. That on the mainland the fashion of decorating sarcophagi with "Early Christian" crosses had its origin in Venice seems likely from documentary evidence: in 1277 Donatus, *Magister Sci Marci*, decorated a sarcophagus on the façade of S. Nicolo in Treviso in this manner. See P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 894, note 31.

Christian ones. Intact specimens of that period were not numerous enough to meet the demand. To be buried in an Early Christian sarcophagus seems to have been a mark of high distinction in the second half of the thirteenth century and in the fourteenth century. As burial customs are very informative in regard to general cultural tendencies, not only in prehistoric and ancient times but also in the Middle Ages, this counterfeiting and mending of Early Christian sarcophagi must be regarded as more than the outcome of a passing fashion. While in Tuscany, Rome, and Southern Italy pagan sarcophagi were used for important burials, the accent in Venice was on sarcophagi with Christian subjects or with subjects which could be taken for Christian ones, such as cupids. This discrepancy between Venice and the rest of Italy is not a fortuitous but an essential one. The insistence of the Venetians on the Christian element gives the entire movement its unmistakable character.

It has been said above¹⁶⁵ that this movement was a parallel to, and perhaps a part of, the protorenaissance movements which can be observed throughout Italian Ducento art. Like these other movements, the Venetian one sprang from a *renovatio* of which it was the monumental expression. However, as the Venetian variety of this *renovatio* was colored by the idea of establishing a connection, and even an unbroken continuity, with the "age of the apostles," and as this movement aimed at a *renovatio imperii christiani* and not at a renewal of the pagan Empire of Rome, the art which it propagated assumed the semblance of Early Christian styles, or, at least, styles that were thought to be Early Christian. The sixth-century type of the ground plan of San Marco, the columnar façade, the early Byzantine style of incrustation—all these are elements that served the same end as the "rewriting" of Venetian history in the thirteenth century, the invention of suitable legends (*vaticinatio*), and the attempts to attribute the forerunner of San Marco, San Teodoro, if not to the time of the apostles, in any case to the period of the great Christian Empire of the East, the Empire of Justinian. In addition, the program of the mosaics of the interior embodies, in part at least, the same ideas: the Old Testament cycle of the atrium copied an Early Byzantine bible, and the mosaicists of the Cappella S. Clemente made use of compositional schemes evolved after the pattern of Ravenna mosaics.

The plastic works treated in this chapter, from the ciborium columns to the sarcophagi of Venice and Padua, are manifestations of the *renovatio* idea in the realm of sculpture. The dates of their creation, repair, or re-employment, fall roughly in the second and third quarters of the thirteenth century, that is to say they coincide with the dates of the columnar façade, the "protorenaissance" style of incrustation.¹⁶⁶ Among the "Early Christian" traits quoted above, there are some which made their appearance earlier. The use of compositional

¹⁶⁵ See *supra*, p. 58 ff. On the revival of Early Christian art in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries see: L. Bréhier, "Les traces"; R. Hamann, "Altchristliches"; J. Garber, *Wirkungen*; W. Paeseler, "Der Rückgriff." On the problem of the mediaeval renaissances in the field of Italian sculpture in general, see: R. Jullian, "Les survivances"; H. Wentzel, "Antiken-Imitationen"; C. A. Willemsen, *Kaiser Friedrich II.*

¹⁶⁶ This subject will be discussed further in volume two.

schemes borrowed from Ravenna and the adherence, in general terms, to the program of the mosaic decoration of the Apostoleion preceded the activity of the "protorenaissance school" of sculpture and mosaic by a considerable time; certain archaic tendencies in Venetian art and civilization are indeed as old as the city itself. But only from about 1240 onwards can we really speak of a movement, of a Venetian protorenaissance. Thus, the establishment of a Venetian protorenaissance in the arts is separated by a certain time-lag from the foundation of the Venetian Empire of the Levant in 1204, a foundation which gave rise to the idea of a *renovatio* and which it was the aim of historians, politicians, and artists to justify. One of the reasons for this delay may be found in the fact that the Venetian *renovatio* theory took some time to acquire a definite shape: it is possible that the difficulties with Frederick II and the wars with other Italian sea powers played a certain part in forming these ideas. Another reason for the time-lag may be seen in the workings of one of the most powerful factors that shaped the art of Venice. Immediately after the taking of Constantinople in 1204, Venice must have been flooded with artists and works of art from Byzantium. For some time Venetian art became, in some respects, almost an offshoot of contemporary Byzantine art. The reliefs of the Virgin in San Marco are sufficient proof of this although the dependence was even more strongly felt in the field of painting, and especially in mosaic. By about 1240, however, the fascination of the looted treasures must have waned, the Greek artists must have dispersed or died out, leaving a vacuum into which the newly formed ideas of the *renovatio* could penetrate. The Byzantine training which the Venetian artists had received in the first third of the century enabled them to imitate whatever models they were given to work on. The workshops of several sculptors and mosaicists were then producing work in the new "Early Christian" style. This protorenaissance movement lasted throughout the temporary eclipse of Byzantium as a training ground for artists and as a source of export, and even a little longer. For when the Latin Empire of Constantinople finally collapsed and the city was retaken by the Greeks in 1261, it took some time before diplomatic, commercial, and cultural relations were re-established between the two former enemies. Consequently, Byzantine influence could not manifest itself immediately after 1261. The new contacts were established in the seventies and eighties of the thirteenth century; from then onwards a new and powerful wave of Byzantine influence reached Venice which all but blotted out the precarious growth of the Venetian protorenaissance.

The impact of this new wave of Byzantine influence made itself felt, for instance, in the workshop of the Heracles Master; there it did not completely disrupt the development of a style which was, after all, evolved on the basis of Byzantine art. But so far as the protorenaissance style was concerned, the new Byzantine wave must have shaken its very foundations.

However, the styles of the protorenaissance did not die out suddenly and completely in the eighties of the thirteenth century, but lived on, in a somewhat altered form, into the fourteenth century. The movement lost its exclusively "Christian" tenor; furthermore, its products took on the character of

"applied arts"—as, e. g., in the case of the Paduan sarcophagi. But the most important and fundamental change was brought about by the belated discovery of classical antiquity at the turn of the century. It is perhaps claiming too much to speak here of a "discovery" or, of a movement, because very few monuments testify to it. The best documented one is a monument of very peculiar character, namely, the door, or, more specifically, the bronze leaves of the door to the right of the main entrance (fig. 63).¹⁶⁷ Professor Prosdocimi has shown that the general form of this door is copied from early Byzantine prototypes. The door is neither dated nor signed, but its chief elements, namely, panels of open-work scale patterns and a framework decorated with rosettes and busts of saints, are identical in form and workmanship with the details of the corresponding door at the left of the central porch which bears the inscription: MCCC — MAGISTER BERTVCIUS AVRIFEX VENETVS ME FECIT. Thus the door at the right of the main entrance is also a work of Bertuccio and must have originated around 1300. Now, this door contains a few elements which are not to be found in Bertuccio's signed work. In addition to all the details of the latter, there are also, on each leaf, two small figures of pagan divinities with cornucopiae and three comparatively large female heads. Both the figures with cornucopiae and the heads, are so purely classical that only the authority of an inscription can persuade us of their date, *ca.* 1300; otherwise they would certainly have been thought to belong either to late classical times or to the High Renaissance of the Cinquecento. This case, however, is not as exceptional as it seems, since these classical details were cast in moulds made from classical originals.¹⁶⁸ Thus they are mechanical reproductions of classical sculptures rather than products of a classical revival. All the same, the fact that reproductions of this kind were made and used for the decoration of one of the doors of San Marco bespeaks a new phase in the development of Venetian taste, if not of Venetian art. At the same time it is significant and characteristic of Venetian practices that mechanical reproductions—copies as close to forgeries as is possible—were admitted without any misgivings on the part of the artist or of the public.

In another case, technique and result were entirely different. A relief on the north façade shows a female figure with a crown on her head, a "ring" in her right hand and a curiously shaped branch in her left (fig. 8). This work does not look classical. The mediaeval date is, so to speak, written all over the curious figure, which was regarded by some as a representation of St. Catherine or another Christian martyr, whereas Cattaneo and Von der Gabelentz call it a "Christian Victory." Neither of these interpretations is correct, though the second is much nearer to the truth than the first. As a matter of fact, the ring-shaped object in the right hand of the figure is a small wreath, the branch in her left a cornucopia. As soon as this is recognized, the meaning of the relief becomes clear: it is a Fortuna or Tyche, and apparently meant to be a personification of Venice. Models must have been available in great numbers; this motif is fre-

¹⁶⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 403 ff.; A. Prosdocimi, "Le porte," p. 532, fig. 5.

¹⁶⁸ P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 804.

quent in Syrian and Parthian art and occurs also in Venetia. To cite only one example: the Museum of Aquileia has a representation of the "Fortuna" of Aquileia accompanied by the River God Natisone, a work of the third century which is sufficiently near to the Venetian relief to make it clear that the latter is modelled after a very similar prototype. The question is, however, at what time the San Marco relief was made. Saccardo placed it in the tenth century, Von der Gabelentz in the twelfth. It is not impossible that it was actually made about 1100 for the Contarini building. In any case, however, its surface must have undergone a complete restoration in the thirteenth century because some details, including the face, are those of thirteenth-century Venetian sculpture such as the reliefs of the second arch of the main porch (especially the personifications of the Virtues). Thus, the thirteenth century certainly had its share in the making of this interesting relief, which is a proof of the revival of classical ideas and forms, not only in the religious sphere, but also in the secular and political ones.¹⁶⁹

Soon after 1300 the entire protorenaissance movement—Early Christian and classical—was swamped by powerful influences from East and West, from the Palaeologan art of Byzantium and from the Gothic art of the West. Thus, the movement had, like all protorenaisances, a rather brief span of life. It was a short-lived attempt on the part of the state to establish artificially a politically inspired, archaizing, pseudonational art. It came to life when the influence of Byzantine art was decreasing, at about 1240, and died when the sources of Byzantine art began to well up once more. However, although the Venetian protorenaissance was a more or less ephemeral manifestation, contemporary with, but profoundly different from, the Tuscan and Apulian movements, its influence can be felt in later Venetian art. In particular, the development of Venetian sculpture, both in its negative and positive aspects, seems to have received its orientation to a large extent from the protorenaissance. In the positive sense, the training which the sculptors received in the restoration and imitation of Early Christian works of art gave them an understanding of high relief and a feeling for plastic solidity which contemporary Byzantine art could never have created. This new feeling for plastic values was not confined to sculpture; it also penetrated Venetian mosaic work. Some authors have felt inclined to ascribe to Tuscan influence the plasticity which appears in the mosaics of the north wing of the atrium (second and third dome of the Joseph story) from about 1260 onwards. This is, however, very unlikely since no other Tuscan elements can be found in Venetian Ducento painting. Besides, this assumption is unnecessary in view of the fact that the sculptural models which could be of most assistance to the Venetian mosaicists were right there before their eyes. That there was a close interrelation between sculptors and mosaicists

¹⁶⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, [p. 271 (St. Catherine), *Dettagli*, V/1, 14 (= pl. 10); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 130; J. Deér, *Porphyry Tombs*, p. 174. Syro-Parthian parallels occur among the finds of Dura-Europos (Yale University, Gallery of Fine Arts). The relief in the Museum of Aquileia, inv. no. 134, is defined as representing the "Genius" of Aquileia with the river god Natisone, third century A.D. For a photograph of this relief I am greatly indebted to the Soprintendente alle Antichità delle Venezie, Padova, Dott^{ssa} Bruna Forlati-Tamaro (neg. no. 1696).

in thirteenth-century Venice can be deduced from the fact that Venetian sculptors copied some of the mosaics of San Marco. As has been shown above, the figures of the Virtues on the face of the second arch of the main portal are copies of the mosaic figures in the Ascension dome, and the motif of the Sawing of Boards in the "Mestieri" cycle of the third arch is derived from the atrium mosaic depicting the Building of Noah's Ark.

However, the protorenaissance also had negative results—if one may be permitted to apply this valuation to a historical process. It is very likely that the stunted growth of Venetian sculpture in general, the fact that Venice never produced anything really great in the field of monumental sculpture, goes back, in the last resort, to the false start which Venetian sculptors made in the thirteenth century with reinterpretations and imitations of the minor arts of a long forgotten era. Their "raw materials" and their models were Early Christian and Early Byzantine ivories or alabaster and marble reliefs with small-scale figures—the same kinds of models which had been the starting points of the short lived renaissances of the Carolingian and Ottonian periods. They never discovered, as did their French and Tuscan colleagues in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the prototypes of monumental sculpture in Roman classical art.¹⁷⁰ Thus, Venice never brought forth a Nicolo Pisano or a Master of the Rheims Visitation. The Venetian sculptors were content to produce small-scale reliefs, which were very much like their models and like the products of another protorenaissance, namely that of the Roman Cosmati. The Paschal candelabrum of San Paolo Fuori le Mura is one of the closest parallels to the Venetian Ciborium columns,¹⁷¹ a fact that is indicative of the artistic level of the productions of the Venetian protorenaissance, which are objects of "applied art" rather than of great sculpture. Perhaps the movement belongs not so much to the history of art as to the history of taste.

4. *Romanesque Sculpture in the Round*. Large-scale sculpture in the round, which in the Ducento had come to occupy first place in the art of other centers, found, on the whole, little favor in Venice. The angels of the central square and the main porch, and the lions and prophets of the former south entrance are the only examples. While these are products of the Antelamesque current, the other trends which helped to shape the art of the Venetian Ducento—the Byzantinizing, the orientalizing and the protorenaissance—were altogether unfavorable to the creation of three-dimensional sculpture of monumental size. There are, it is true, the seated figures of Christ and the evangelists of the Ciborium, works which are close in style to the figures of the Ciborium columns and which are undeniably conceived and executed as three-dimensional statues; but they are far from being monumental. These stocky, ill-articulated, and stereotyped figures exhibit typical traits of small-scale sculpture; the pettiness of the details

¹⁷⁰ R. Hamann-McLean, "Antikenstudium"; H. Ladendorf, "Antikenstudium," with bibliography, p. 121 ff; H. Wentzel, "Antiken-Imitationen," esp. p. 70, note 113; A. M. Bessone-Aurelj, *I Marmorarii*; G. Matthiae, "Componenti"; J. Roosval, "Protorenaissance."

¹⁷¹ E. Hutton, *The Cosmati*, p. 19 ff., fig. 39 ff.

and the unduly large heads are particularly characteristic in this respect (fig. 64).¹⁷²

Curiously enough, there are demonstrable links between these figures and a group of works which, of all the Venetian products of this time, come closest to monumental sculpture. The latter group embraces the so-called *Sogno di San Marco*, now above the main entrance of the church (figs. 66, 101), and the remnants of an Adoration of the Magi, which are at present exhibited in the Museo Patriarcale at Sta Maria della Salute, but which were originally in SS. Filippo e Jacopo.¹⁷³ The relationship between the two groups consists in the similar configuration of the draperies with their soft, wavy hems and loose ends falling between the knees. The seated figures of the Ciborium and those of the Adoration also have in common a massive heaviness which takes the place of real monumentality. There is not the least feeling for organic form in these figures; the upper parts of their bodies, instead of resting lightly, weigh down heavily on the hips. Insofar as the two groups differ between themselves, the linear definition of the draperies in the Adoration group is more precise, the proportions are more normal, and, above all, there is a new element of "direction" in the Virgin's glance. In this respect, the Virgin's figure points forward to the sculptural creations of Nicolo and Giovanni Pisano.¹⁷⁴

The Adoration group consists of the Virgin, St. Joseph, and only one of the Magi. It is generally assumed that these figures filled a tympanum, that is, an arched niche above an entrance. This is suggested by the fact that the back of the figures has been left in a rough state, and by the compositional arrangement, which seems to fit very well into a half circle. However, this arrangement is due only to the arbitrary manner in which the group has been exhibited in the Museum, where the side figures were placed on a lower level than the enthroned Virgin. Moreover, it would be rather difficult to fit two more adoring figures into the composition and still keep a semicircular outline; yet an Adoration with only one King would be highly irregular. Another consideration which makes this reconstruction very unlikely is that each of the remaining three figures has its separate plinth, that of the Virgin being rounded in front, while those of Joseph and the King are rectangular in plan.

The problem can be solved with the help of the so-called *Sogno di San Marco* (fig. 101) which, in all likelihood, was originally a representation of Joseph's Dream (the annunciation of the birth of Jesus to Joseph, or Joseph being warned to flee to Egypt). That this group is a work of the Adoration Master goes almost without saying, the mutual identity of the draperies and of Joseph's face and skullcap, etc. being self-evident. The rectangular base clearly indicates the breadth and depth of the block from which the group was carved. The

¹⁷² See *supra*, p. 168, note 139; see also P. Toesca, *Il trecento*, fig. 365.

¹⁷³ On the *Sogno* and the Adoration, see *supra*, p. 15, and H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 191 ff., fig. 14; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, pp. 793, 896; R. Jullian *L'éveil*, p. 288 ff., note 5, with bibliography.

¹⁷⁴ The work of Giovanni Pisano which seems to me to come nearest to the Virgin of the Venice Adoration, is the half-length figure in the Pisa Cathedral Museum: H. Keller, *Giovanni Pisano*, pls. 2, 3.

vertical contour at the right edge suggests that the group was meant to be placed in a rectangular niche, or to be set into a wall, or else that it was to be part of a series of scenes joined together so as to form a horizontal frieze.

As a matter of fact, we find all three alternatives employed in a monument which is linked to these Venetian works by strong stylistic ties, namely, the sculptured decor of the baptistery of Parma.¹⁷⁵ In addition to figures placed in niches and others set into walls, we find there free-standing statues and high reliefs. Apparently an unforeseen interruption of the work prevented Benedetto Antelami from completing and setting up the sculptures of the twelve Months and the allegories of the Seasons, which were presumably intended to be arranged in a series of niches or as a continuous frieze. Instead they were placed, quite inorganically, on the parapets between the columns of the first gallery.¹⁷⁶ In their isolated position they recall the Venetian sculptures. It is very likely that the latter were also meant to be parts of a larger cycle; perhaps this cycle was even completed and set up, only to be broken up later. It is impossible to say whether San Marco was its original home.

The parallel with the sculptures of Parma goes beyond a general similarity: the Venetian group is certainly the work of a sculptor who received his training in the workshop of Benedetto in Parma. This workshop must have been extraordinarily large, even by the standards which prevailed in the building of mediaeval cathedrals. Professor De Francovich has traced no less than eight different hands in the eight lunettes of the interior alone,¹⁷⁷ and the whole *équipe* must have included dozens of collaborators of all ranks. As the Venetian sculptures under review are later by a generation than those of the Parma baptistery, one cannot hope to find proof of an identity of workmanship, but one can easily see that the style of the former was developed from that of the latter. For this one need only assume that greater maturity had been attained in the meantime and that a new element had been introduced by the study and copying of Early Christian forms. The queenly Virgin in the tympanum of the north portal of the Parma baptistery¹⁷⁸ is the ancestress of the enthroned Virgin of the Museo Patriarcale, with the French accent replaced by an unmistakable Latin strain.

Adolfo Venturi ascribed the Venetian group, without sufficient reason, to an artist who called himself *Donatus Magister Sci Marci de Venetiis* in an inscription of 1277 in San Nicolo in Treviso. This Donatus he identified with an artist of the same name who collaborated with Nicolo Pisano in Siena. This whole hypothesis is untenable,¹⁷⁹ the more so since Venturi attempted to enlarge the highly heterogeneous oeuvre of this hypothetical artist by including the four figures of prophets in the niches of the Cappella Zeno (fig. 103).¹⁸⁰ Actually,

¹⁷⁵ G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, fig. 298 ff., esp. 355 ff.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 229 ff.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, figs. 234 ff.

¹⁷⁹ A. Venturi, "Lo scultore"; *idem*, *Storia*, II, p. 540. For a discussion of the problem, see L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 33 ff. For Donatus, see also *supra*, note 164.

¹⁸⁰ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/5, 1.9-9b (= pls. 217-217b) H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 198 ff.; A. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 514; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 34 ff., fig. 2.

these figures have nothing to do with Donatus and very little to do with the sculptures which should be grouped around the Adoration of the Museo Patriarcale. Their relationship with the latter is one of common ancestry; but they seem to belong to a different line of evolution. The four Zeno prophets are usually considered to be a generation later than the Adoration,¹⁸¹ whereas to me they seem to be much nearer to the sculptural decor of the Parma baptistery¹⁸² than to works of the end of the century. Three of the figures are characterized by simple, linear draperies and by an undifferentiated pillar-like silhouette which makes one think of hermae.¹⁸³ These features are more in keeping with a date around 1240-50 than with the period around 1300. The latter date may have been suggested by the architectural framework—i.e. the columnar niches of the "apse" which must indeed be attributed to the end of the thirteenth or the first years of the fourteenth century. But the statues of the prophets do not seem to have been made for their present location, which they do not fit at all. Apart from the fact that their style indicates an earlier date, they are too small for the tall niches in which they stand on consoles of later workmanship. It must not be forgotten that the present Zeno Chapel is the result of extensive rebuilding, and contains elements not only of the sixteenth century but also of the thirteenth and fourteenth. Quite possibly the prophets, as well as the lions, were originally part of the decoration of the south façade of this entrance hall.¹⁸⁴

A special place in the development of monumental sculpture in Venice is occupied by the very large and almost fully rounded relief of St. Christopher on the north façade (fig. 104). It is part of the thirteenth-century program and is in its legitimate place. From the thirteenth century onwards St. Christopher was frequently depicted on the outside of ecclesiastical buildings, preferably in big dimensions so he could be seen by passers-by and thus protect them from sudden death. The representation of this Saint was usually in painting; it is indicative of the rising power of Venetian sculpture that it was here translated into relief. This form of the Christopher image is indeed rather rare; another such example, the huge relief on the façade of the church of Gemona (Friuli), is linked by close ties to the Venetian prototype. The St. Christopher relief of San Marco still bears traces of its derivation from fresco paintings: the indication of ermine on the inside of the cloak, the linear pattern of the drapery, and the rich ornamentation of the garment are traits which were surely taken over from a painted prototype. In spite of this, the sculptor shows a feeling for plastic values; the full, heavy modelling of the relief recalls the last of the Madonna reliefs of the interior (viz., the Madonna dello Schioppo, fig. 107) and the relief in the southeast pillar of the central square.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸¹ L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 34.

¹⁸² Cf., e. g., G. De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami*, figs. 234 ff., 266.

¹⁸³ The figure at the extreme left (Habakkuk) is stylistically "later" than the rest; it may have been partly remodeled on the occasion of its transfer from the south portal into the chapel.

¹⁸⁴ See *supra*, p. 120.

¹⁸⁵ St. Christopher: L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 44, fig. 19, with a date about 1300, which is in my opinion too late. On the Christopher at Gemona cathedral, see C. Ermacora, *Il Friuli*, p. 83 ff., with illustrations.

V. THE SYNTHESIS OF GOTHIC AND PALAEALOGAN ELEMENTS

The re-establishment of the Greeks in Constantinople in the third quarter of the thirteenth century made the pendulum of Venetian art swing back again to its starting point. A new wave of Byzantine influence made itself felt in painting and in relief sculpture, as can be seen in the last works carried out in the atelier of the Heracles Master. Of course, the flatter the relief, the more closely the artist was able to follow the rules and usages of Byzantine design. The wooden relief of St. Donatus in Murano, dated 1310,¹⁸⁶ shows the application of a Byzantine drapery design to a western ecclesiastical costume. It is certainly the work of a Venetian who had studied Byzantine models.

By what means such models once more found their way to Venice has remained unknown; that they did, cannot be doubted. One of these imported pieces can definitely be regarded as being of Greek origin; it bears a curious inscription which gave rise to a popular misconception in quite early times.

The relief, now in the Cappella Zeno, is designated in the inscription as "Anike-tos" (the Invincible), and represents the Virgin enthroned with the Child standing on her knee, or, rather, responding eagerly to her embrace (fig. 35). The composition corresponds to the iconographic type of the Eleousa.¹⁸⁷ The inscription which has found its way into the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, says that "the water which Moses once produced from a rock by his prayer flows now by the efforts of Michael, whom Christ may protect together with his consort Irene."¹⁸⁸ Four little holes, arranged crosswise below this inscription served undoubtedly for fixing a bronze appliqué (a cross?); popular imagination, however, regarded them as water spouts and venerated the relief as part of the rock from which Moses drew water in the desert. This curious misunderstanding must have been current at least as early as the fifteenth century, that is, before the adaptation of the entrance hall as a memorial chapel for the sepulchre of Cardinal Zeno. The French pilgrim Jehan de Tournai saw the relief there "dessoubz le portal d'icelle eglise" in 1487 and related that the "image was made of the stone which Moses touched with his rod in the desert and from which water issued miraculously . . . by four holes. . . ." ¹⁸⁹

The inscription which caused this pious misconception is squeezed in at the right-hand side of the throne; it does not give the impression of having been planned as part of the relief from the very beginning. On the other hand, its

¹⁸⁶ L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 48 ff., fig. 23, with bibliography.

¹⁸⁷ See *supra*, p. 121, note 20; *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti* (Doglioni), p. 261; (Sansovino), p. 265; A. Pasini, *Guide*, p. 238; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 136; S. Bettini, *La scultura*, II, p. 26.—On the iconographic type, see N. Likhachev, *Istoricheskoye znachenie*, p. 151 (fig. 352) and note 118. N. P. Kondakov, *Ikonografiya Bogomateri*, II, p. 380 f.; V. Lasareff, "Studies," p. 26 ff., esp. 38.

¹⁸⁸ The inscription is in the right margin, within the frame; it is incised, rather carelessly, in the same manner as the other inscriptions and monograms. It reads:

ΥΑΩΡ ΤΟ ΠΙΝ ΜΕΝ ΕΚ ΠΕΤΡΑΣ ΡΥΕΝ ΞΕΝΟΣ ΕΥΧΗ ΠΡΟΗΧΘΗ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ
ΜΟΥΣΕΩΣ ΤΟ ΝΥΝ ΔΕ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΜΙΧΑΗΛ ΠΙΟΥΑΗ ΠΕΕΙ ΟΝ ΟΩΖΕ ΧΡΙΣΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΝΕΥΝΟΝ
ΕΙΡΗΝΗΝ

The inscription is reprinted in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*, IV, p. 329, no. 8706.

¹⁸⁹ B. de la Fons-Melicoq, "Voyage," p. 134.

palaeographic character fits the thirteenth century very well; it could hardly, therefore, have been added much later. The likeliest assumption is that it was engraved shortly after the completion of the relief in order to dedicate it for its specific use. What this use was is quite clear from the inscription: the panel must have served as a dedicatory icon of an aqueduct or a fountain. According to the inscription, the means for ensuring the water supply—whatever form it took—were provided by one Michael and his consort Irene. Some authors have identified the donor with Michael Kalaphates (eleventh century), an identification which, of course, is quite impossible for stylistic and palaeographic reasons. The only Byzantine emperor who fits the given conditions is Michael IX, who reigned from 1295 to 1320 and whose wife, Ricta, Xene, or Maria, was on occasion also called Irene.¹⁹⁰ It is difficult, however, to accept this identification, since the influence of this relief can already be traced in Venetian sculpture of the early fourteenth century. An image made in Byzantium at that time and dedicated by a Byzantine emperor would hardly have found its way to Venice so soon after its dedication. There are, however, other possibilities as well. For instance, the Michael of the inscription could be a Despot of Epirus, perhaps the second of this name (1237–1271), and the relief may have been looted from one of the towns of his despotate.¹⁹¹

Whatever its origin, this relief introduced to Venice a new phase of nascent Byzantine art. The profound revolutions of the thirteenth century had greatly altered the aspect of Byzantine sculpture. It had lost something of its almost abstract precision and had gained in volume and in softness of surface treatment. A similar aspect of Byzantine art is represented by the half-length figure of an angel, now kept in a fragmentary state in the Lapidarium, in the courtyard behind San Marco.¹⁹² The egg-shaped head with the high coiffure is typical of the Palaeologan style.

This new style served in Venice as a point of departure towards a new development, as Byzantine influences had done so often before. Venetian artists assimilated the new style of Byzantium, and combined it with their own tendencies and with other influences, especially those of the Italian mainland and the West. As in the case of sculpture of the early thirteenth century, one might sometimes doubt whether the works in question are importations, or works made in Venice by foreign artists, or, finally, products of the synthetic art of Venetian sculptors. One of the best pieces of this kind—and, indeed, one of the finest reliefs in all of San Marco—is the so-called Madonna dello Schioppo. It is an image of the standing Hodegetria (fig. 107),¹⁹³ in which the relationship

¹⁹⁰ See C. Ducange, *Historia*, I, p. 236. This name is given to her in an epitaph by Theodore Metochites.

¹⁹¹ The fact that the Michael of the inscription bears no specific title, would normally point to an emperor; but such an omission of the title would also suit the despots of Epirus. Michael II's wife was, however, Theodora Petraliphas. N. P. Kondakov, *Ikonografiya Bogomateri*, II, p. 380ff., while disregarding the inscription, attributes the relief to the second half of the fourteenth century, and considers it the work of an artist working in Istria or Corfu.

¹⁹² Photo Böhm, no. 3487.

¹⁹³ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/6, N. 12, 13 (= pl. 259); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 134; P. Toesca, *Storia*, I, p. 803; N. Likhachev, *Istoricheskoye znachenie*, p. 108.

between the Divine Child and his Mother has been given a "modern" form, full of tender sentiment. The Child, instead of holding a scroll in his left hand has taken hold of the Virgin's right hand—a most suggestive motif which, together with the loving smile of the Madonna, is already imbued with the new Gothic spirit. The relief rises from flat surfaces that look as though they were drawn or engraved, to an almost fully three-dimensional plasticity.¹⁹⁴

The Gothic element in this relief is not in any way obtrusive; it is due more to the new humanism of the early Trecento than to any determinable stylistic influence. From the point of view of style in the purely formal sense, the relief is much nearer to the Aniketos of the Zeno Chapel than to any western Gothic model. In any case, it shows as yet nothing of the florid, modish Gothicism which, to a large extent, dominated Venetian sculpture in the fourteenth century. The Palaeologan style of the Aniketos was continued by numerous artists of lesser merit, both in Venice itself and in its environs.¹⁹⁵ One of the most interesting examples of this provincial, indeed local, art is the relief of the enthroned Madonna from San Francesco, Portogruaro, now in the Museum of that town.¹⁹⁶ The relief, which is very high, was cut from a Roman *cippus*, the other parts of which are not only traceable but actually collected in the very Museum which houses the Madonna. This is, of course, proof that the relief was made in Portogruaro itself and not imported. The artist may have drawn his inspiration from works like the enthroned Madonna in the wall of the north transept of San Marco (the Cappella della Madonna). An inscription on the plinth of the Portogruaro Madonna, which gives the date of September 1313, is engraved on a separate piece of stone and may not belong to this monument; but its date cannot have been very different. A replica of this enthroned Virgin may still be seen in a niche high up on the wall of the apse of Portogruaro cathedral.¹⁹⁷

These and other provincial adaptations of Palaeologan models show few specifically Gothic traits; the spirit in which the Byzantine prototypes were transformed was still that of local Romanesque. However, as time went on, the western connections of Venice made themselves felt; together with the Palaeologan elements, they produced a hybrid art, a Byzantinizing Gothic or Gothic Byzantinism which was the last attempt on the part of Venice to force a synthesis of the two antithetic movements. The artists succeeded in this as long as they strove for decorative effects in comparatively low relief. As soon as they began to vie with their Tuscan or Paduan colleagues in trying to create fully rounded sculpture or high relief, they produced very awkward work of incredible clumsiness. Only in the hands of artists gifted with a light touch could this combination of heterogeneous elements be moulded into something

¹⁹⁴ The standing Hodegetria on the pillar next to the Cappella del SS. Sacramento is a feeble product of a related workshop.

¹⁹⁵ A list of pertinent works is given by H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 154, and L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," *passim*; G. Mariacher, "Appunti."

¹⁹⁶ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 156, fig. 13; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 100, with bibliography; P. L. Zovatto, "Antichi monumenti," p. 63 ff.; G. Mariacher, "Appunti."

¹⁹⁷ P. L. Zovatto, "Antichi monumenti," p. 65, fig. 39.

like a synthesis. To what degree it depended upon individual talent or training may be seen in comparing the two reliefs of equestrian saints in the Baptistery, the representations of St. George and St. Theodore (figs. 105, 106).¹⁹⁸ The reliefs are companion pieces but were made by two different artists. The sculptor of the St. George was an extremely spirited designer with an admirable feeling for decorative effects realized in agitated, fleeting forms. The charger of the Holy Warrior gallops to the right, jumping over the dragon; the Saint sits his horse almost nonchalantly, turning sideways and driving his lance into the dragon's teeth; his cloak and the horse's tail are streaming in the swift race. The forms are rhythmically arranged so as to fill the given space without crowding it. The relief of St. Theodore is the work of a much clumsier hand. Everything is awkward, from the representational as well as from the decorative point of view. The horse does not jump, it "climbs" over the dragon; there is no *tempo*, no movement in the picture as a whole; horse and figure are too large, so that they almost burst the frame. The two reliefs stand in a relationship which is similar to that between the two seated warrior saints of the façade. It cannot, however, be said with equal certainty that the master of the one relief was a Greek while the other was a Venetian, since we know too little about Byzantine sculpture in the Palaeologan period. Moreover, the contrast between the two reliefs may be due simply to a diversity in the personalities of the artists, to temperament rather than to nationality.

The last Byzantine wave, to which these two reliefs owe their existence, produced many works of sculpture in Venice. One of the most interesting is the elaborately framed relief of the Baptism of Christ in the Baptistery (fig. 108).¹⁹⁹ Not until the last quarter of the Trecento, however, did Venetian sculptors again produce works which can compare in artistic quality with the best products of the thirteenth century and especially with the sculptures of the façade of San Marco.²⁰⁰ The masterpieces of the Venetian Ducento contained the promise of a great future. They seemed to foreshadow a flowering not so much of monumental sculpture as of an intimate art of great vivacity and sensitiveness. This promise was not fulfilled until the time of the Massegne, and then without any Byzantine elements.

¹⁹⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/5, L. 2 (= pl. 229), L. 4 (= pl. 231); L. Venturi, *Storia*, II, p. 250; H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 215; P. Molmenti, *Storia*, I, p. 370; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 146, figs. 99, 100.

¹⁹⁹ *La Ducale Basilica, Dettagli*, V/5, L. 3 (= pl. 230); H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 212 f.; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," p. 45 f., with bibliography.

²⁰⁰ H. Von der Gabelentz, *Mittelalterliche Plastik*, p. 207 ff.; L. Planiscig, "Geschichte," *passim*; P. Toesca, *Il Trecento*, p. 298 ff.

APPENDICES

FERDINANDO FORLATI

THE WORK OF RESTORATION IN SAN MARCO

San Marco is a monument of such great importance that it is the duty of Italians and of all art connoisseurs in the world to preserve its character as faithfully as possible. Unfortunately, this building is structurally defective as a result of having been built in an epoch when building technique was not equal to its task; moreover, it has been ravaged for centuries by fire and earthquake and by negligence of every kind. Let us remember too that the masonry consists of bricks and mortar of poor quality which have, to a large extent, disintegrated and have consequently lost much of their compressive strength and cohesion. To this we may add the continuous, unequal settlement of the foundations.

I shall briefly speak not of the alterations in, and additions to, the primitive basilica, which have already been studied thoroughly by Mr. Demus, but of the means employed through the centuries to consolidate the structure. The earlier attempts were, in large part, empirical; only later was the work of restoration and repair done with a full awareness of the problems involved and of the difficulty of the task. Actually, the church was not only renewed several times in its structural parts; it has needed continuous repairs, so that a permanent technical office had to be established in order to attend to these.

It is a well known fact that, up to the fall of the Republic, the basilica was under the patronage of the doges, who always took zealous care of its rights. In addition, it was also maintained by a special office with very high administrative functions, whose members were chosen among leading citizens who had performed outstanding services for the State. These were the Procurators, whose origin, according to tradition, coincides with that of the church itself. Actually there is no evidence of such an office before the eleventh century, the age of Contarini.¹ Under the jurisdiction of the Procurators were both the administrators of the basilica and the technical office, which was directed by the Proto.² It was the duty of the Proto to deal with all injuries suffered by the basilica, but because of either technical inexperience or insufficient funds this was not always done.

The documents preserved in the archives of the State of Venice are, naturally, scarce as regards the earlier centuries, but they become more numerous and detailed in the course of time.

¹ *La Ducale Basilica, Testo*, p. 29 ff.

² Unfortunately there is no list of the persons successively appointed to this office. I believe that one of the earliest known was Giovanni Corvo whose son worked in Dalmatia in the fourteenth century, according to the interesting report of Signor Fisković, at the XVIIIth International Congress of Art (1955).

Fire was the first cause of damage to our church, as it was to many other ancient monuments. Setting aside the burning of the basilica during the revolt of Candiano IV, another fire broke out in 1230-1231 which burned the charters of popes and emperors, and other documents that were kept in the treasury.³ In 1419 even more serious damage was caused by a great fire which is vividly described in the diaries of Marino Sanudo.⁴ According to tradition—there was suspicion of arson—this fire spread from a chimney of the Ducal Palace to the central dome of the basilica. Soon all the timber of the roof was burning, and the lead “colava per le gronde che pareva fosse acqua.” Sanudo says “parea quella notte che tutta la piazza ardesse” and the Zorzi chronicle adds that all night long many noble citizens “stete suxo a far repari.”⁵

According to Sanudo, the domes were immediately rebuilt “molto più forte e notevolissime più che prima” at an expense of 16,000 ducats. Whether because the work was done too hastily and carelessly or because there was a lack of vigilance, the roof caught fire again in 1439,⁶ thus causing new and even more serious damage, both from the fire itself and from exposure to the elements. The damage was repaired under the dogate of Francesco Foscari (1423-1457). On 24 June 1452 the Maggior Consiglio approved special measures for financial aid, which were continued in the following years.⁷ Moreover, according to Signor Gallo, the imposing passage constructed in the fifteenth century between the Ducal Palace and San Marco (which was later enriched with the “Porta della Carta” and the Arco Foscari) was intended to support and strengthen the deteriorating walls of the basilica on the south side. These walls were reinforced again under Giovanni Mocenigo (1478-1485) after another serious fire in 1474.

We cannot state precisely the nature of these works of restoration nor can we say to whom they were entrusted. We know only the indications of damage: cracking vaults, damaged walls, and falling mosaics.

In 1470 Antonio Zerlaga, Proto of the church, and five other specialists were asked to give advice concerning the “Vault of the Crucifixion” (the one between the dome of the Pentecost and the dome of the Ascension). All declared “ch’el sta mal et minaza gran ruina.” Another architectural feature which may have been introduced during this period is revealed in the early sixteenth-century painting representing the preaching of Saint Mark in Alexandria, by Gentile and Giovanni Bellini. This painting shows, on both sides of a church which seems to be San Marco, two strong buttresses of masonry which were apparently in existence at that time.

We are better informed concerning the restorations after the beginning of the sixteenth century. Bartolomeo Buon succeeded Spavento, (appointed Proto in 1490) and then, on 7 April 1529 after the death of Buon,⁸ the Procuratori of San Marco, “ottimamente informati della sufficienza e bontà di Maestro Jacopo

³ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, nos. 92, 93, 94.

⁴ Marino Sanudo, *Diari*. Biblioteca Marciana, cl. 7, cod. 794.

⁵ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, nos. 109, 110.

⁶ Marino Sanudo, *op. cit.*

⁷ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, nos. 116, 117, and 119; R. Gallo, “Il portico,” p. 15 ff.

⁸ *La Ducale Basilica, Documenti*, no. 173.

Sansovino architetto," elected Sansovino Proto of the Procuratoria with a salary of 80 ducats a year.

The value of Sansovino's contribution is clearly demonstrated by the emolument given to him by the Procurators—who, like all the administrators of the Serenissima, were not liberal with public money. After one year, he was paid 120 ducats and after another six months, 60 more ducats; in 1531 he obtained the free use of a shop and two rooms in St. Mark's square.⁹ This great architect attended to the work entrusted to him until his death; his son Francesco could rightly boast that "la chiesa di San Marco stata per trent' anni sui pontili, fu conservata e salvata da lui."¹⁰

In singling out Sansovino for his achievements I am not speaking of the new works of art with which he enriched the basilica, but of actual restorations. Sansovino devoted special attention to reinforcing the domes "dai fondamenti dei piloni," whose poor construction "a sacco" has been a never-ending source of trouble, "ai legnami della cima." Further details of his work are recorded by Bernardino Zendrini, the famous mathematician, in a report dated 1744. Zendrini describes the buttress built to contain the vaults north of the choir.¹¹ The big longitudinal and transverse tie-beams which he employed in the floors of the galleries in order to consolidate and connect the walls still exist; he also provided chains as a means of girding the domes which had been supported by struts ever since the ruinous fires of the previous century. Despite the excellence of Sansovino's restorations, they must be considered provisional efforts.

After Sansovino had been dead for four years, the fire of the Ducal Palace in 1574 destroyed the roof and one of the pinnacles of the south façade of the dome of St. Leonard. These injuries were soon repaired,¹² and in 1594 the windows of the dome and the roof above the choir underwent restoration.¹³ The work was so inadequate, however, that it was not long before people were complaining that rain penetrated into the church through the lead covering of the roof.¹⁴

In 1604 the windows of the Zeno chapel were walled up, its roof was restored, and the crypt was temporarily reopened, after it had been closed by Sansovino because of floods.¹⁵

In 1630 Baldassare Longhena was appointed Proto of the Procuratoria, an office which he held until the time of his death fifty years later.¹⁶ We know that he restored the façade, the north dome, and the roof above the sacristy; he enlarged the five small windows of the arch above the altar of the Madonna and those of the tympanum wall above the door of the Baptistry. Naturally, work was continued on the roofs and particularly on the domes.

⁹ *Ibid.*, nos. 175, 177, 178.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, no. 207.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, no. 682.

¹² *Ibid.*, no. 331.

¹³ *Ibid.*, no. 353.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, no. 358.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 365.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, no. 438 ff.

Longhena was succeeded by Sardi, Sardi by Tirali. Next the Procuratori appointed the famous mathematician Bernardino Zendrini who supervised the work between 1721 and 1744.¹⁷

According to Zendrini, urgent repairs were needed at the following points: the crevice in the arch above the atrium; the wooden framework flanking the arch with Christological scenes; the dome above the high altar; and, finally, the lead covering of the roofs. All these restorations were done under the technical direction of Tirali, with Zendrini as supervisor.

The central dome had to be repaired, since the timber which supported the outer shell had rotted and the base and sides of the inner shell were in a perilous condition. The supports of the central arch above the main door were strengthened with two massive buttresses, and the iron chains which bound the walls were renewed. The same reinforcement was provided for the arch of the atrium facing Sant'Alipio and for that facing the Zeno chapel.

In 1724 the south dome was reinforced with buttresses and rebuilt; in the following years Zendrini secured the north dome by surrounding its drum with steel chains, as well as the west dome and the arch on the left of the high altar, which had already been strengthened by Sansovino with an external buttress.

Roberto Zuccareda and Marco Gregori, whose report, dated 29th March 1780, still exists, were responsible for the last general restoration of the basilica, employing the usual system of chains and buttresses.¹⁸

After the fall of the Republic, San Marco was at first under the supervision of the Kingdom of Italy. In 1818 the Austrian Government began the work of restoration with the partial repair of the lead roof of the church, authorizing, to defray expenses, the sale at public auction of jewels from the treasury.¹⁹

In 1820²⁰ under the direction of Cesare Fustinelli, the large circular window of the south transept was repaired, unfortunately causing the destruction of part of the ancient mosaics around it. Afterwards a government commission was appointed, headed by Diedo and composed of Lazzari, Zandomeneghi, and Minio (later replaced by Meduna). This commission once again undertook the repair of the five domes and of the arch supporting the dome of the Ascension. The commission was dissolved in 1853, and the direction of the works was entrusted to Meduna, who obtained from the Austrian Government a yearly allowance of 60,000 lire from 1856 until 1866. To Meduna is due the first unfortunate campaign of renovation in accordance with the tenets of Viollet Le Duc.²¹

It was under his direction and that of Saccardo, who had been church warden of San Marco since 1861, that the south and north lateral façades were renewed. Everything was straightened, the columns and the capitals were scraped, the

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, *Testo*, p. 213ff. *Documenti*, no. 618ff. There is an accurate account of the work of Zendrini in the report of Signor Manfredi, dated 1904 (cf. *infra*, note 27).

¹⁸ *La Ducale Basilica*, *Documenti*, no. 782.

¹⁹ Notice of the vestry board of San Marco, 5 June 1819.

²⁰ *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 431ff.: "I restauri moderni dal 1797 sino ad oggi—norme per la conservazione del Monumento a cura dell' Ing. F. Berchet" (published also in a separate edition).

²¹ The Crypt, which had been inaccessible since the fifteenth century except for short intervals, was drained at the same time: cf. *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 237ff.; cf. *supra*, note 15.

old decorations were made anew, and the old marble slabs were replaced by new ones of a different kind. To these restorations must be added that "disgraziata invenzione" (to use the words of Berchet), the pavement of the left aisle of the basilica, which was completely remade by the firm of Salviati, after the ancient pattern, but perfectly leveled and done with the use of modern techniques and material.

The Venetian artists, led by Alvise Zorzi, rebelled against these measures, especially after the intervention of Ruskin; as a result, the renovations were stopped for a while.²²

The principal works executed between 1882 and 1887, under the direction, first of Berchet and afterwards of Saccardo, were the restoration of the principal façade at the corner of the Piazzetta dei Leoncini, which necessitated rebuilding the masonry of the walls and resetting the ancient marble revetment; the restoration of the roofs of the sacristy, of the passage behind the apse, of some arches in the principal façade, and of the arch above the right organ, "lucidando a piombo i marmi della fronte della piazzetta per far loro riprendere l'antico colore"²³ The internal piers at the corner facing the Piazzetta dei Leoncini were also rebuilt. At the same time the new south façade was made to harmonize with the principal one, giving to the monument "in un punto importante l'antica struttura ed il preesistente splendore dei marmi a vena ondulata a macchia aperta."²⁴ In 1885 the tombs of Doge Falier and of Dogressa Felicitas Michiel were restored; in 1886-1887 the chapel of Sant'Isidoro was extensively repaired. In the latter, the mosaics were cleaned and the precious marble slabs were lifted and afterwards set back in place. In the wall which separates the chapel from the north transept, small grilled windows of ancient date were discovered.

In the following decade the restoration of the interior walls was continued, as well as that of the two great lunettes of the principal façade, to the right of the central window. The arch above the Manin memorial was refaced. At several points the marble revetments were replaced where they were missing, or consolidated where they were about to fall down (in the Zeno chapel, the Baptistery, the entrance to the sacristy, on the piers at each side of the main door, the walls and piers in the chapels of the Sacrament and of San Pietro).²⁵ These repairs and restorations were in general limited to the decorative elements.²⁶

Finally, the fall of the bell tower in 1902 opened the eyes of the public to

²² A. P. Zorzi, *Osservazioni*.

²³ Owing to Zorzi's criticism, the Board of Education intervened and appointed a supervisory commission composed of Gb. Ferrari, Franco, L. Cadorin, Pompeo Molmenti, and Berchet. In a report of 1880, Zorzi insisted on the principle that preservation must prevail over reconstruction and that the work must be done directly by the "opera" and not by commercial firms. These principles, which were confirmed by a regulation approved in 1882, correspond entirely to those we now hold, even if their implementation was not always above reproach.

²⁴ Report of F. Berchet, in *La Ducale Basilica*, *Testo*, p. 237 ff.

²⁵ On this occasion some parts of the interior of the basilica were washed with sponge and water, which aroused the suspicion that they had been scraped; the same criticism was voiced after an identical washing executed in 1955.

²⁶ P. Saccardo, *I restauri*, 1890, 1892.

the precarious condition of Venetian monuments in general, and to that of San Marco in particular. It was realized that occasional repairs were not sufficient; that it was necessary to have accurate knowledge of the situation as it then existed, and a definite program of repairs. Such a program was prepared and made public in a highly accurate report by Manfredi, assisted by Ingegnere Marangoni.²⁷ As a result, work was begun under the direction of Sullam and continued under the late Signor Marangoni, who succeeded Manfredi as Proto of San Marco and devoted his knowledge and his enthusiasm to the basilica from 1902 to 1948.

The criteria which he followed in his work of restoration appear clearly from what he published in his well known book "L'architetto ignoto di S. Marco"²⁸ and particularly in his report of 1946.²⁹ He believed that the foundations of the church are sound, but not the masonry of the piers, whose footings are only about one metre below floor level and whose construction in "mura a sacco" technique is poor. As a result, the vaults above have undergone deformations owing to subsidence, a condition aggravated even more seriously by the wooden frames inserted in the masonry at the imposts of the arches. He found also that the timber in the framework of the roofs and the domes was in a very weakened condition.

His forty years' work included the reconstruction of some of the piers of the tribunes and of one of the piers of the lower story; of the "volta del Paradiso," that of the Apocalypse, and that with scenes from the life of Christ. On the exterior he restored the corner of Sant' Alipio, and rebuilt the masonry of the south transept which, however, even after so many years, still has a hard, new appearance.

There is no doubt that Marangoni was very careful in his repairs and that he attained remarkable results in the work of consolidation. Nevertheless, he could not avoid demolishing a number of ancient walls, even though he remade them with new material, employing the well-known system of "scucire e cucire."

When I was appointed to this office in 1948, I at first had to continue using the same methods of restoration in finishing the work already begun, replacing the mosaics which had been removed from the north arch, and continuing the rebuilding (which I found already initiated) of the masonry of the arches, of the vault and the pendentives above the marble rood-screen of the Delle Massegne.³⁰

Even then, I did not wish to take down the mosaics, after the cartoons of Tintoretto, which decorated the vault; and I succeeded in rebuilding the masonry from the back. This is how it was done: we built a strong centering, covered it

²⁷ M. Manfredi, *Basilica*.

²⁸ L. Marangoni, "L'architetto."

²⁹ L. Marangoni, *La Basilica*.

³⁰ In *Arte Veneta*, 1948, p. 159 ff. I reported the criteria which I intended to follow in the restoration of the famous Basilica after it had been entrusted to me. For the successive operations, see in the same review "Il primo S. Marco" (1951), p. 72 ff.; "La tecnica dei primi mosaici di S. Marco" (1949), p. 84 ff.; "Nuovi lavori a S. Marco" (1952), p. 216; "Lavori a S. Marco" (1955), p. 241.

with fresh plaster of Paris and, having secured the mosaic with canvas (glued on the surface) and with tin foil, pressed the centering firmly against the surface of the arch so that the latter rested safely on this wooden construction. Then, proceeding from above, we gradually dismantled the vault in small sections, until we reached the back of the mosaic. The interstices between the tesserae were freed from the old plaster with all possible care and then we laid on the new plaster in order to secure the mosaic to the new masonry.

When this restoration was completed, we were able to free the presbytery from the heavy scaffolding (fig. 109) which was then employed on the south arch, where there was even greater justification for keeping the old mosaics in place. The old brick structure, which supported the mosaics and had been reduced to fragments, was rebuilt in the same manner as was the vault with the Tintoretto mosaics. May I add that repairs of this nature had never before been executed on so grand a scale, the arches having a diameter of more than twelve meters.

The photograph (fig. 110) shows on the right, the disintegrated condition of the vault; on the left, the new vault firmly rebuilt. Figures 116 through 118 show more clearly than do words the technique employed in the restorations.

While we were doing this delicate work, grave signs of deterioration appeared on the pier with the famous relief of the Madonna del Bacio (southwest pier of the central dome). Having removed the marble facing with all possible care, and having made a precise record of it, consisting of both photographs and drawings, we found the masonry seriously cracked in a vertical direction. This meant that the nucleus of the pier's masonry (the "sacco interno") was being gradually crushed. To remedy this, we used for the first time in San Marco cement injections, now so commonly employed in building. The steel girders with which the pier was surrounded made it possible to obtain a quick and firm consolidation, and we were able to retain the original material of the building (fig. 111). The marble facing was then replaced, thus preserving its original irregularity.

At the same time, the pier, against which the "altare del Crocefisso" is placed, revealed signs of disintegration, indicated by the sudden displacement of the marble revetments. Here, too, it was necessary to adopt the technique described above, viz. strengthening the load-bearing part of the structure, yet retaining the original appearance so completely that no traces of the operation are now left. Even the arches supporting the so-called galleries were rebuilt, including their imposts. Following the methods used for so many years by the Venetian School of Mosaic, the mosaics were taken off and replaced in their exact positions.

Indeed, all the piers required strengthening. While we were still at work on the pier of the Crocefisso, the need suddenly arose to reinforce the one at the corner of the south transept. After repeated injections of cement at high pressure (up to 8 atmospheres) it regained its strength, so that its security is assured for the future. To be quite certain of the results, we invited Professor Fritsch of Vienna University to test the piers by the most modern geo-electric methods.

He came to San Marco with one of his assistants and made accurate measurements. To this check we added another one, based on the transmission of sound, developed at the Institute of Research of Bergamo. Both methods yielded the same result: in the lower zone of the piers both electric current and sound encountered some difficulty in transmission. After new tests, it was found that this was caused not by the presence of empty spaces, but by the dampness from the sluicing of the pavement and from moisture rising from below ground through capillary action. To rectify this dangerous condition, betonite was injected into the lower parts of the piers; this colloidal substance, at it expands, completely insulates the piers against all dampness rising from the foundations. The shells of the domes, too, were in serious need of repair, those of masonry as well as those of wood and lead. In the masonry dome above the high altar, especially in its lower zone, dangerous cracks were visible through the mosaic revetment. The mosaics (mainly decorative, in particular around the small windows) had to be removed and the damaged masonry had to be rebuilt. Up to now only half of this work has been done, because other repairs, especially those of the piers, needed the immediate attention of the workmen, who are too few to cope with both restorations. However, during the past year we have been able to remove the ugly wooden, eighteenth-century tribunes,³¹ which were falling to pieces.³²

The wooden superstructure of the Pentecost cupola was threatened by decay. Here we renewed the supporting frame which was completely rotten, replacing it piece by piece, from the inside. Only in this way were we able to preserve all the irregularities of the dome's surface, those dating from the original construction as well as those caused by weathering. We also wanted to preserve the old sheets of lead "a staffa," which were so worn out that they no longer prevented the infiltration of water, but which, on the other hand, presented a very picturesque appearance with their variegated patina. We achieved this by using as roofing material a new foil (only 1.4 mm. in thickness) which by itself provides sufficient insulation, and on top of this we placed the old sheets of lead in their original location. Now that the work is completed, nothing of this ingenious and expensive restoration can be seen. Lately, we have begun similar repairs on the dome of St. Leonard, above the south transept (figs. 112, 115).

Years ago Marangoni was seriously concerned about the preservation of some of the precious marbles, especially the Proconnesian and the red marble of Verona, which were crumbling because of the slow but inexorable action of the salt atmosphere of Venice. All attempts to find a remedy were fruitless. The Istituto Centrale del Restauro in Rome has come to our help by recommending the use of acritic resins, which, in the spring of last year, we repeatedly spread on the deteriorated surfaces by means of sprinklers. Up to now the results have been excellent; the resins have helped preserve many precious sculptures, such as the Roman marble support of the large porphyry cup used as a holy water basin, and the bas-relief of the Morosini sarcophagus.

³¹ One of these was a false tribune that was not intended to be used.

³² This work yielded an unexpected surprise. We found a fragment of mosaic on the east wall of the south arch. It is a mosaic doubtlessly belonging to the earliest decoration of the church. Cf. G. Galassi, "I nuovi mosaici."

In the atrium, above the door leading to the Zeno chapel, we had to undertake, with the usual urgency, the repair of the wall, as ominous cracks were appearing through the mosaic depicting the slaying of Abel. On this occasion we had the good fortune to discover traces of the exact procedure followed by the old mosaic workers. On the last coat of plaster the scene which was afterwards rendered in mosaic was painted in full colors; a lower stratum of plaster revealed the preparatory drawing (*sinopia*) (figs. 113, 114). Also in the atrium, several other mosaics belonging to the Old Testament cycle were strengthened on different occasions, as the need for this arose. Among the mosaics restored were: the two scenes of the tower of Babel, the lunette of Abraham, those of Sarah and Isaac, the figure of St. Geminianus, St. Mary Magdalen, and especially the Virgin and the apostles in the niches above the main door, the oldest mosaics of the basilica. These were also freed from recent overpainting.

Special methods were also devised for the tessellated pavement of the twelfth century, so that no trace of the consolidation that was recently carried out is now visible. After making accurate records, and in certain cases, even marking the pieces, the pavement was taken up in small sections in order to rebuild the corroded sub-floor. A special material was applied to the back of the deteriorated tesserae in order to embed them more securely in their old place. Needless to say, the well-known irregularities of the surface were scrupulously preserved. Applying the same methods, we worked in the atrium, in the right aisle,³³ and in the chapel of the Sacrament.

Finally, the outside of the main apse was freed from recent coats of plaster, thus revealing the Contarini architecture.

To sum up, we can distinguish three phases in the restoration of San Marco. The first phase is characterized by external and superficial remedies like tie-rods, chains, and the like, which must today be considered as of very limited durability. The second phase, which employed more advanced techniques, aimed at substituting new walls for old ones. This method led, however, to the irrecoverable loss of the material substance of the ancient monument. The third and most recent phase has evolved methods which aim at not altering in any way the external appearance of the church, while consolidating the structure from the inside.

The methods employed in the most modern phase of restoration have achieved results of undeniable importance. The mosaics of the south arch of the central dome were kept in place, while the vault itself (twelve metres in diameter) was reconstructed. The outer shell of the dome of the Pentecost was restored in such a way as to make it seem that its old lead roofing has not been touched. The pavement of the narthex was consolidated without destroying the old fragmentary slabs of marble. The original masonry of the basilica was reconstituted through cement injections at high pressure. The effectiveness of these modern methods and techniques is, I believe, fully demonstrated by the condition and appearance of San Marco today.

³³ In the course of doing this work we found a circular well, which is 1.20 m. in diameter at the top; at about two metres below the floor there is a change of material and the diameter of the well shrinks to 75 cm. Judging by the technique and the quality of the bricks, it appears to be Roman work.

LIST OF DOGES

to 1400*

Paulicius (Paulutius)?	697-717
Marcellus	717-726
Ursus	726-737
Magister Militum (Dominicus) Leo	
" " Felix Cornicula	
" " Deusdedi(t)	737-742
" " Jubianus Ypatus	
" " Johannes Fabriacus	
Deusdedi(t) Ypatus	742-755
Galla (Gallus)	755-756
Dominicus (Monegarius)	756-764
Mauricius	764-787
Johannes	787-804
Obilierius and Beatus	804-811
Agnellus (Particiacus)	811-827
Justinianus (Particiacus)	827-829
Johannes (Particiacus) (I)	829-836
Petrus (Trandenicus)	836-864
Ursus (Particiacus) (I)	864-881
Johannes (Particiacus) (II)	881-887 (888?)
Petrus (Candiano) (I)	887
Petrus (Tribunus)	888-911
Ursus (Paureta), (Particiacus) (II)	911-932
Petrus Candiano (II)	932-939
Petrus Badoario	939-942
Petrus Candiano (III)	942-959
Petrus Candiano (IV)	959-976
Petrus Ursoyolo (Orseolo) (I)	976-978
Vitalis Candiano	978-979
Tribunus Meni(us)	979-991
Petrus Ursyulo (Orseolo) (II)	991-1009
Otoni (Otto Orseolo)	1009-1026
Petrus Centranicus	1026-1031
Ursus patriarcha	1031-1032
Dominicus Ursyulus (Orseolo)	1032

* After H. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte*.

Dominicus Flabianus	1032-1042/3
Dominicus Contarenus (Contarini)	1042/3-1071
Dominicus Silvus (Silvio)	1071-1084
Vitalis Faletro (Faliero) Deodoni	1084-1096
Vitalis Michael (Michiele) (I)	1096-1102
Ordelafo Faletro (Falier)	1102-1118
Dominicus Michael (Michiele)	1118-1130
Petro Polano (Polani)	1130-1148
Dominicus Mauroceni (Morosini)	1148-1156
Vitalis Michael (Michieli) (II)	1156-1172
Sebastianus Ciani (Ziani)	1172-1178
Aurio Mastropetro (Malipiero)	1178-1192
Henricus Dandolo (Dandolo)	1192-1205
Pietro Ziani	1205-1229
Jacopo Tiepolo	1229-1249
Marino Morosini	1249-1253
Renier Zeno	1253-1268
Lorenzo Tiepolo	1268-1275
Jacopo Contarini	1275-1280
Giovanni Dandolo	1280-1289
Pietro Gradenigo	1289-1311
Marino Zorzi	1311-1312
Giovanni Soranzo	1312-1328
Francesco Dandolo	1329-1339
Bartolomeo Gradenigo	1339-1342
Andrea Dandolo	1343-1354
Marino Falier	1354-1355
Giovanni Gradenigo	1355-1356
Giovanni Dolfin	1356-1361
Lorenzo Celsi	1361-1365
Marco Cornaro	1365-1368
Andrea Contarini	1368-1382
Michele Morosini	1382
Antonio Venier	1382-1400

CHRONOLOGICAL SYNOPSES

HISTORY:

421	25th March: Mythical birthday of Venice.
539	Ravenna and Venetia become part of the Eastern Roman Empire.
568	Invasion of Italy by the Longobards.
	Withdrawal of Aquileian bishop to Grado.
572-586	Patriarch Elias of Grado.
628 (?)	Gift of marble Cathedra Sci Marci to Grado by the Emperor Heraclius.
697 (?)	Beginning of dogate in Heracliana.
716	Aquileia and Grado recognized by Rome.
726	Beginning of Iconoclastic controversy; uprising against Byzantium in Northern Italy.
751	Ravenna falls to the Longobards.
774/75	Bishopric of Rialto (Olivolo) set up.
809/810	Venice taken by the Franks.
812	Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle: Venice returned to Byzantium.
819	Building or rebuilding of S. Teodoro.
	Foundation of S. Ilario.
820-827	S. Pietro, Olivolo, begun.
827	Council of Mantua.
828/29	<i>Translatio</i> of relics of St. Mark from Alexandria.
829	San Zaccaria built.
830	First church of San Marco begun.
836	Relics of St. Mark placed in San Marco.
840	<i>Pactum</i> of Emperor Lothair.
967	Synod in favor of Grado.
976	Revolt against Petrus IV Candiano: San Marco I burnt, subsequently rebuilt (San Marco II).
ca. 1000	First Pala d'oro ordered in Constantinople.
1019-1044	Poppo of Aquileia.
1024	Synod in favor of Grado.
1027	Synod in favor of Aquileia.
1044	Privilege of Benedict IX in favor of Grado.
1053	<i>Constitutiones</i> of Leo IX in favor of Grado.
1082	Chrysobull of Alexius Comnenus.
1084-1094	Relics of St. Mark placed in San Marco III (<i>Inventio, Apparitio</i>).
1093-1094 (?)	Consecration of San Marco III.
1100	Relics of St. Nicholas brought to S. Nicolò di Lido from Myra.
1102-1117	Consecration of altars (?) in San Marco.
1105	Second Pala d'oro ordered in Constantinople.
1106	Great fire, damage to San Marco.
1117	Earthquake
1125	Relics of St. Isidore brought to Venice from Chios.
1140	Church of San Marco, Palermo.
1148 ff.	Crisis in Venetian State Church.
1152	First ducal <i>promissio</i> .
1171	Venetians resident in Byzantium incarcerated.
1175	Third part of Tyre donated to Opera Sci Marci.
1177	<i>Pactum</i> of Venice.
1180	Treaty between Grado and Aquileia.
1182	Massacre of Latins in Byzantium.
1204	Conquest of Constantinople by Fourth Crusade (Impresa).
1209	Pala d'oro restored and enlarged.
1221	Confraternità di Sta Maria (dei Mascoli) founded (in Crypt).
1221-1223	Earthquake
1230-1231	Fire destroys Tesoro.
1250	Primicerius receives privileges.

1257-1270	Wars against Genoa.
1258	Pillars of Acre and Pietra del Bando shipped to Venice.
1261	Constantinople reconquered by Michael Palaeologus.
1268	Miracle of the relic of the True Cross acknowledged at instigation of Raniero Zeno.
1290	Capitello Altar transferred into church from Piazza.
1345	Pala d'oro restored and reset.
1355	Altar of St. Isidore consecrated.
1430	Altar of Cappella dei Mascoli consecrated.
1462	Altar of St. Paul consecrated.
1471	Altar of St. James consecrated.
1486	Present chapel of S. Teodoro built.
1617-1618	Altars of Sts. John and Leonard rededicated (Nicopeia and True Cross).
1732	San Marco receives relics of Beato Pietro Orseolo.
1807	See of Patriarchate transferred to San Marco.
1808	Altar of St. Peter dismantled.

ARCHITECTURE:

Ninth century

830ff.	Building of first church of San Marco by Partecipacii, in all probability as cruciform building, between slightly earlier chapel of S. Theodore and Doges' palace. It is possible that part of the supporting walls of the present church go back to this first building (San Marco I), in particular the west wall with its niche-portal. Small crypt under crossing. Perhaps lateral narthex.
--------	---

Tenth century

976	Fire; swift rebuilding by the Orseoli (San Marco II), probably without essential changes.
-----	---

Eleventh century

1063 (?) to 1094 (?)	Erection of new church (San Marco III) under the Doges Contarini, Selvo, and Falier, after model of Holy Apostles in Constantinople, as five-domed building of brick, with few additions in stone. West narthex with apse-like niches at either end. Cruciform crypt.
1071	Inscription in narthex (no longer preserved) designates advanced stage of completion.
1084 (?)	<i>Inventio</i> of relics.
1094 (?)	Consecration.

*Twelfth century**First quarter of twelfth century*

1106	Fire; extent of damage unknown. Possible strengthening of arches in choir chapels and transept. Bronze door, with donor inscription of Leonardus da Molino.
------	--

Second half of twelfth century

	Completion of campanile. Rio Batario filled; S. Geminiano transferred. Bequests for Opera Sci Marci. Removal of part of gallery floors (?).
--	--

*Thirteenth century**First quarter of thirteenth century*

	Transportation of building material, marble, columns and sculptures from Constantinople to Venice. Removal of remaining gallery floors.
1221/23	Earthquake; extent of damage unknown.

Second quarter of thirteenth century

1231	Fire of Tesoro. Erection and vaulting of north wing of atrium under Doge Marino Morosini (†1253); work on west façade: incrustation and columns. Cupolas heightened.
------	---

Third quarter of thirteenth century

- ca. 1260/65 West façade completed; work on north façade and Porta dei Fiori.
 1267 Paving of Piazza.

Fourth quarter of thirteenth century

- Porta della Madonna (S. Giovanni).
 South façade (?).

*Fourteenth century**First quarter of fourteenth century*

- 1300 ff. Bronze doors by Bertuccio.
 1309 Captains ordered to collect marble.
 Tracery windows of west and north façades; socles of all façades.
 Baptistery installed under Giovanni Soranzo (1312-1328).

Second quarter of fourteenth century

- Cappella Sant'Isidoro built; entrance in north transept closed.

Second half of fourteenth century

- 1385 ff. Work on Gothic "capitelli" (canopies) of façades.

Fifteenth century

- 1419-1439 Fires; damage to cupolas and apse. Renewal of roofs, repairs.
 Opening of great west window, of circular window in Cappella San Clemente, and of rose window in south transept.
 Strengthening of arch in south transept.
 ca. 1430 Cappella dei Mascoli installed.

Sixteenth century

- 1503-1515 Installation of sepulchral chapel of Cardinal G. B. Zen.
 1529 ff. Sansovino Proto di San Marco; insertion of tension rods.
 1574 Fire; repairs.

Seventeenth century

- 1604 Zeno chapel restored.
 1615 ff. North façade restored.
 1640 Dome of north transept restored.
 1641 ff. Enlarging of windows.
 1675 ff. Cupolas and roofs restored.

Eighteenth century

- 1709 Two more cupolas restored; vault above main entrance secured.
 1713 Lower part of north façade restored.
 1720 Marble incrustation of west façade and Zeno chapel restored.
 1721-41 Strengthening of cupolas and vaults.
 1778 Expert opinions sought regarding lamentable state of façades, followed, until 1780, by consolidation.
 1781 ff. Minor repairs of façade, cleaning of incrustation.

Nineteenth century

- 1818 Repair of roofs.
 1820 Rose window of south transept restored; Tesoro restored; windows enlarged.
 1829-34 Repair of cupolas (roofs).
 1842 Cleaning of façades.
 1855 Cappella San Pietro: two windows walled up, one door opened.
 1860-64 Complete restoration of north façade; part of incrustation renewed; strengthening of piers.
 1865-77 Far-reaching renewal of south façade.
 1882 ff. Repairs of main façade; old marble incrustation preserved.
 1883-87 Rerestoration of south façade; original marble revetment partly replaced.
 1887 ff. Work on west façade continued; repairs in Cappella Zeno, Baptistery, and Cappella San Pietro; repairs on marble revetment of interior; restoration of crypt.

Twentieth century

- See Appendix by Forlati and bibliography in note 70, p. 75.

SCULPTURE:

Fourth to ninth century

Spoils from the Italian mainland, from the lagoons, and from the Eastern Mediterranean.

Ninth to eleventh century

Interlaced patterns; copies and imitations of Byzantine decorative reliefs.

End of eleventh and beginning of twelfth century

Stereotyped friezes:

- (a) in terracotta, probably executed by workmen from Pomposa;
- (b) capitals in inlay technique, and
- (c) in cut stone.

Remnants of decoration of late eleventh-century façade:

Two caryatids at left and right of great arch round the Last Judgement; gargoyles; relief with lions (?).

Second half of twelfth century

Early group of heads of corbel table (?).

1170ff. Corner groups of the two Piazzetta columns, trades and professions.

Beginning of thirteenth century

Spoils from Byzantium and Eastern Mediterranean.

First quarter of thirteenth century

Lions of Zeno Chapel, copies and adaptations of Byzantine spoils.

Second quarter of thirteenth century

Early works of Heracles Master's workshop:

Icons of west façade, first, second, and fourth doors from right, reliefs from thirteenth-century iconostasis, first and second arch of central portal, latest parts of corbel table, four angels of central square.

Middle and third quarter of thirteenth century

Late works of Heracles Master's workshop:

Porta di Sant'Alipio,
Porta dei Fiori,
icons of former transept altars.

Restoration, adaptation, and copying of early Christian works:

Ciborium columns, lintel of Porta di Sant'Alipio, etc.,
reliefs in the Cappella delle Reliquie, sarcophagi.

Evangelists of altar ciborium, *Sogno*, prophets of Cappella Zeno (?),
third arch of central portal.

Fourth quarter of thirteenth century

External arch of Zeno chapel, *sopraporta* of Porta San Giovanni.

First quarter of fourteenth century

1300ff. Bertucius, bronze doors;
marble reredos of Cappella San Pietro.

Second quarter of fourteenth century

Reliefs of Baptistry and Cappella Sant'Isidoro;
reliefs of frieze on north and south façades.

Third quarter of fourteenth century

1354 Tomb of Andrea Dandolo in Baptistry.

Fourth quarter of fourteenth century

Choir screen and "custodie" of relics by the Delle Massegne.

Fifteenth century

Sculptural decor of upper story of façade.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ÅBERG, N. "The Orient and the Occident in the Art of the Seventh Century (II, Lombard Italy)," *Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademies Handlingar*, LVI, no. 2 (Stockholm, 1945).
- ADHÉMAR, J. "Influences antiques dans l'art du moyen âge français," *Studies of the Warburg Institute*, VII (1939).
- AGAZZI, A. *Il mosaico in Italia* (Milan, 1926).
- ANCONA, P. D'. See D'ANCONA, P.
- ANGELILLIS, C. *Le porte di bronzo bizantine nelle chiese d'Italia* (Arezzo, 1924).
- ANGELIS D'OSSAT, G. DE. See DE ANGELIS D'OSSAT, G.
- ANRICH, G. *Hagios Nikolaos*, 2 vols. (Leipzig-Berlin, 1917).
- ANTHONY, E. W. *Early Florentine Architecture and Decoration* (Cambridge, Mass., 1937).
- ANTI, C. "La tomba del Doge Marino Morosini nell' atrio di S. Marco," *Arte veneta*, VIII (1954), p. 17 ff.
- ARMINGAUD, J. "Venise et le Bas-Empire. Histoire des relations de Venise avec l'Empire d'Orient," *Missions scientifiques*, IV (Paris, 1864).
- ARSLAN, E. *La pittura e la scultura veronese dal secolo VIII al secolo XIII* (Milan, 1943).
- L'Augusta Ducale Basilica di S. Marco a Venezia* (Venice, 1761).
- AYNALOV, D. *Vizantiyskaya zhivopis' XIV stoletiya* (St. Petersburg, 1917).
- BALTRUŠAITIS, J. *Le moyen âge fantastique. Antiquités et exotismes dans l'art gothique* (Paris, 1955).
- BANDMANN, G. *Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger* (Berlin, 1951).
- BARZON, A. S. *Prodocimo, apostolo della Venezia occidentale* (Padua, 1949).
- La Basilica di Aquileia. A cura del comitato per le cerimonie celebrative del IX. centenario della basilica e del I decennale dei militi ignoti* (Bologna, 1933).
- BATTISTELLA, A. "La politica ecclesiastica della Repubblica di Venezia," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, XVI, no. 1 (1898), pp. 386-420.
- BAYET, J. *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (Paris, 1926).
- BEENKEN, H. "Die Florentiner Inkrustationsarchitektur des XI. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift f. Bildende Kunst*, LX (1926-27), pp. 221 ff., 245 ff.
- BEISSEL, S. "Die mittelalterlichen Mosaiken von San Marco," *Zeitschrift f. Bildende Kunst*, VI (1893), col. 231 ff.
- BELLONI, G. "Gli avori di S. Mena fra i cammelli della supposta cattedra di S. Marco delle civiche raccolte d'arte di Milano," *Archeologia cristiana*, I, no. 2 (1952), pp. 133-144.
- BERTAUX, E. *L'art dans l'Italie méridionale* (Paris, 1904).
- BESSONE-AURELJ, A. M. *I marmorarii romani* (Milan-Rome, 1935).
- BESTA, E. *Il diritto e le leggi civili in Venezia fino al Dogato di Enrico Dandolo* (Venice, 1900).
- BETHMANN, C. L. "Die Evangelienhandschrift zu Cividale," *Neues Archiv für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, II (1877), p. 112.
- BETTINI, S. "Di San Marco, e di altre cose," *Arte veneta*, VI (1952), p. 196 ff.
- "I mosaici dell'atrio di San Marco e il loro seguito," *ibid.*, VIII (1954), p. 22 ff.
- "La Pala d'oro e gli insigni cimeli del tesoro e del santuario marciani," *Illustrazione Vaticana*, VIII (1937).
- *L'architettura di San Marco; origine e significato* (Padua, 1946).
- *La scultura bizantina*, 2 vols. (Florence, 1944).

- BETTINI, S. *Mosaici antichi di S. Marco a Venezia* (Bergamo, 1944).
 ——— "Padova e l'arte cristiana d'Oriente," *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, I (1936-37), p. 203 ff.
 ——— *Venezia* (Venice, N.D.).
- BEYLIÉ, L. DE. See DE BEYLIÉ, L.
- BIEHL, W. *Toskanische Plastik des frühen und hohen Mittelalters* (Leipzig, 1926).
- BISTORT, R. *La repubblica di Venezia delle trasmissioni nelle lagune fino alla caduta di Costantinopoli* (Venice, 1919).
- BLANKENBURG, W. VON. See VON BLANKENBURG, W.
- BOFFITTO, G. "Le figurazioni nell'arte della leggenda aviatoria d'Alessandro Magno," *Bibliofilia*, XXIII (1921-22), p. 268 ff.
- BÖHM, O. "Note on the Mosaic of the Discovery of the Body of St. Mark in the Basilica of St. Mark, Venice," *The Burlington Magazine*, XVII (1910), p. 40 ff.
- BOITO, C. *L'architettura del medioevo in Italia* (Milan, 1880).
 ——— (Ed.) *La Ducale Basilica*, etc. See *La Ducale Basilica*.
- BONA, P. *Rerum liturgicarum libri duo* (Paris, 1672).
- BONI, G. "I fondamenti del campanile di S. Marco di Venezia," *Il filotecnico*, II (1887), pp. 245-263.
 ——— "Il leone di San Marco," *Archivio storico dell'arte*, V (1892), p. 301 ff.
 ——— "Il muro di fondazione del campanile di San Marco," *Archivio veneto*, XXIX, no. 2 (1885), p. 355 ff.
 ——— "Scavi in Piazza San Marco," *Archivio veneto*, XXXV, no. 1 (1888), p. 257.
- BOŠKOVIĆ, G. *L'art médiéval en Serbie et Macédoine* (Belgrade, 1949).
- BOUCHAUD, P. *La sculpture venitienne* (Paris, 1913).
- BOVINI, G. *I sarcofagi paleocristiani* (Vatican City, 1949).
- BRANDT, P. *Schaffende Arbeit und bildende Kunst* (Leipzig, 1927).
- BRÉHIER, L. "Études" and "Nouvelles recherches sur l'histoire de la sculpture byzantine," *Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, N.S., I, no. 3 (1911), pp. 19 ff., 93 ff.; II, no. 9 (1913), p. 1 ff.
 ——— *La sculpture et les arts mineurs byzantins* (Paris, 1936).
 ——— "Les églises d'Aquitaine à coupes et l'origine de leur architecture," *Journal des savants*, N.S. XXV (1927), p. 241 ff.
 ——— "Les traces de l'ancien art chrétien dans l'art roman auvergnat," *Cahiers archéologiques*, I (1945), p. 63 ff.
- BRESSAN, E. *La basilica di S. Marco in Venezia* (Venice, 1943).
- BRICCARIELLI, C. "San Marco di Venezia e l'Apostoleion di Costantinopoli," *Civiltà cattolica*, LXVI, no. 4 (1915), pp. 147 ff., 422 ff.; LXVII, no. 1 (1916), p. 24 ff.
- BROCKHAUS, H. *Die Kunst in den Athosklöstern*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1924).
- BROMMER, F. *Herakles: Die zwölf Taten des Helden in antiker Kunst und Literatur* (Münster-Köln, 1953).
- BROWN, H. F. "The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople to the Close of the Twelfth Century," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XL, no. 1 (1920), p. 82 ff.
- BRUNETTI, M., S. BETTINI, F. FORLATI, and G. FIOCCO. *Torcello* (Venice, 1940).
- BRUSIN, G. "Il posto dell'altare in chiese paleocristiane del Veneto e del Norico," *Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte* (Festschrift für Rudolf Egger), I (Klagenfurt, 1952), p. 212 ff.
 ——— *Nuovi monumenti sepolcrali di Aquileia* (Venice, 1941).
 ——— "Su uno scavo recente nell'Arsenale di Venezia e della sua interpretazione," *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, XCIX, pt. 2 (1939-40), p. 985 ff.
- BRUYNE, L. DE. See DE BRUYNE, L.
- BUCHER, W. *Die Zellschmelze der Pala d'oro zu S. Marco in Venedig. Eine Studie zur Geschichte dieses Kunstwerkes auf technischer Grundlage* (Diss. Breslau-Ohlau, 1933).
- BURDACH, K. *Reformation, Renaissance, Humanismus* (Berlin, 1918).
- BUSCHBECK, E. H. *Der Portico de la Gloria von Santiago de la Compostela* (Vienna-Berlin, 1919).

- CAMESINA, A. "Die Darstellungen auf der Bronzethüre des Haupteinganges von St. Marco in Venedig," *Jahrbuch der K. K. Central Commission für Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale*, IV (1860), p. 1ff.
- CANAL, D. *Brevi cenni sopra la prodigiosa immagine di Maria Vergine che si venera nella basilica di San Marco in Venezia* (Venice, 1833).
- CANALE, M. DA. See ROSSI, A. "La cronaca."
- X CAPPELLETTI, G. *La basilica di San Marco illustrata e descritta* (Venice, 1854).
- *Storia della chiesa di Venezia dalla sua fondazione sino ai nostri giorni*, 13 vols. (Venice, 1849-53).
- CARPEGNA, N. DI. See DI CARPEGNA, N.
- CARY, G. "Alexander the Great in Mediaeval Theology," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XVI. nos. 1, 2 (1954), p. 98ff.
- CASSI, G. *Il mare adriatico. La sua funzione attraverso il tempo* (Milan, 1915).
- CASSON, S. "Byzantium and Anglo-Saxon Sculpture - I," *The Burlington Magazine*, LXI (1932), p. 265ff.
- CATTANEO, R. *Architecture in Italy from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century* (London, 1896).
- *L'architettura in Italia dal secolo VI al mille circa* (Venice, 1888-89).
- La Cattedrale di Ferrara, 1135-1935* (Rome, 1935).
- CECCHELLI, C. "Arte barbarica cividalese," *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, XV (1919), p. 55ff.
- *I monumenti del Friuli del sec. IV al XI: I, Cividale* (Milan, 1943).
- *La cattedra di Massimiano ed altri avori romani orientali*, I (Rome, 1936).
- "Sguardo generale all'architettura bizantina in Italia," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, IV (1934), p. 1ff.
- CECCHETTI, B. *Delle origini e dello svolgimento dell' arte vetraria muranese* (Venice, 1872).
- "Di una creduta testa di S. Marco e di altre reliquie," *Archivio veneto*, XXX (1885), p. 167ff.
- *Il doge di Venezia* (Venice, 1864).
- *Monografia della vetreria veneta e muranese* (Venice, 1874).
- "Nomi di pittori e lapidisti antichi," *Archivio veneto*, XXXIII (1887), p. 43ff.
- CERBANI, C. "Translatio S. Isidori," *Recueil des historiens des Croisades. Historiens occidentaux*, V, p. 321ff.
- CESSI, R. "Documenti relativi alla storia di Venezia anteriore al mille," *Testi e documenti di storia e di letteratura latina medioevale*, I (Padua, 1940).
- *Le colonie medievali in Oriente. I, La conquista* (Bologna, 1942).
- "Nova Aquileja," *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, LXXXVIII, no. 2 (1928-29), p. 543ff.
- *La repubblica di Venezia e il problema adriatico* (Naples, 1953).
- "Le prime conseguenze della caduta dell'esarcato ravennate nel 751." Estratto dagli "Atti del V Congresso internazionale degli studi bizantini," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 5 (Rome, 1936), pp. 79-84.
- *Storia della Repubblica di Venezia*, I, II (Milan-Messina, 1944-46).
- *Venezia ducale. I, Duca e popolo* (Venice, 1940).
- CICOGNA, E. A. *I due gruppi di porfido sull' angolo del tesoro della basilica di S. Marco in Venezia esaminati e descritti* (Venice, 1845).
- *Sullo scoprimento del Corpo di S. Marco Evangelista* (Venice, 1811).
- CICOGNARA, L. *Storia della Scultura dal suo risorgimento in Italia sino al secolo di Napoleone*, 3 vols. (Venice, 1813-18); 2nd ed., 7 vols. (Prato, 1823-24).
- A. DIEDO and G. SELVA. *Le fabbriche e i monumenti cospicui di Venezia*, 2nd ed. (Venice, 1838).
- CIPOLLA, C. "Ricerche sulle tradizioni intorno alle immigrazioni nelle lagune," *Archivio veneto*, XXVIII (1884), p. 297ff; XXIX (1885), p. 391ff; XXXI (1886), p. 441ff.
- CLEMEN, P. and M. HÜRLIMANN. *Gotische Kathedralen in Frankreich* (Zürich-Berlin, 1937).
- COLASANTI, A. and C. RICCI. *L'art byzantin en Italie* (Paris, 1923).
- COLETTI, L. "Intorno a qualche scultura romanica del veneto," *Arte veneta*, VIII (1954), p. 61ff.

- CONTARINI, G. B. *Spiegazione della basilica metropolitana di San Marco Evangelista*, 2nd ed. (Venice, 1854).
- CONTARINI, P. *Venezia religiosa* (Venice, 1854).
- CORBEAU, A. "Sur la splendeur byzantine," *L'arte*, N. S., VIII, no. 2 (1951-52), p. 51ff.
- CORNELIUS (CORNER), F. *Ecclesiae Venetae antiquis monumentis nunc primum editis illustratae ac in decades distributae*, I-XVIII (Venice, 1749).
- COSTANTINI, G. "Le colonne del ciborio di San Marco a Venezia," *Arte cristiana*, III (1915), pp. 8ff. 166ff., 235ff.
- CRICHTON, G. H. *Romanesque Sculpture in Italy* (London, 1954).
- DA CANALE, M. See ROSSI, A. "La cronaca."
- DALL' AQUA GIUSTI, A. *I quattro cavalli sulla facciata della basilica di San Marco* (Venice, 1894).
- DALLA BARBA BRUSIN, D. *Scultura decorativa altomedioevale a Grado* (Aquileia, 1955-56).
- DALTON, O. M. *Byzantine Art and Archaeology* (Oxford, 1911).
- DA MOSTO, A. *I dogi di Venezia, con particolare riguardo alle loro tombe* (Venice, 1939).
- DAMERINI, G. "I cavalli sulla basilica di San Marco," in: *Amor di Venezia* (Bologna, 1920), p. 95ff.
- D'ANCONA, P. *L'uomo e le sue opere nelle figurazioni del medio evo* (Florence, 1923).
- DANDOLO, A. *Andreae Danduli Chronicon*, ed. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, XII (Milan, 1728), p. 14ff. New edition by G. Monticolo (Città di Castello, 1939).
- DE ANGELIS D'OSSAT, G. *Le influenze bizantine nell'architettura Romanica* (Rome, 1942).
- DE BEYLIÉ, L. *L'habitation byzantine* (Paris-Grenoble, 1902).
- DE BRUYNE, L. "Materia e spirito nella plastica paleocristiana," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, XXV (1949), p. 25ff.
- DECKER, H. *Venedig* (Vienna, N.D.).
- DEÉR, J. "Die Baseler Löwenkamee und der süditalienische Gemmenschnitt des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der abendländischen Protorenaissance," *Zeitschrift f. Schweiz. Archaeologie und Kunstgeschichte*, XIV, nos. 3, 4 (1953), p. 129ff.
- *The Dynastic Porphyry Tombs of the Norman Period in Sicily*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, V (Cambridge, Mass. 1959).
- DE FRANCOVICH, G. *Benedetto Antelami, architetto e scultore, e l'arte del suo tempo*, 2 vols. (Milan-Florence, 1952).
- "Contributi alla scultura romanica veronese," *Rivista del R. Istituto di Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte*, IX (1942), p. 103ff.
- "Il problema delle origini della scultura cosiddetta longobarda," *Atti del I Congresso Intern. di Studi Longobardi* (Spoleto, 1952), p. 255ff.
- "Willigelmo da Modena e gli inizi della scultura romanica in Francia e in Spagna," *ibid.* VII (1940), p. 225ff.
- DEHIO, G. and BEZOLD, G. v. *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1892).
- DE LA FONS-MELICOQ, B. "Voyage archéologique au XV siècle," *Annales archéologiques*, XXII (1862), pp. 48ff., 86ff., 113ff., 245ff.
- DE LASTEYRIE, R. *Architecture religieuse en France à l'époque romane*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1929).
- DELBRÜCK, R. *Antike Porphyrwerke* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1932).
- DELEHAYE, H. "Loca Sanctorum," *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLVIII (1930), p. 5ff.
- DE MAGISTRIS, C. "Cattedra arabica di S. Pietro di Castello," *La Venezia*, 187 (1887), p. 202.
- DEMUS, O. "A Renaissance of Early Christian Art in Thirteenth-Century Venice," *Late Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of A. M. Friend, Jr.* (Princeton, 1955), p. 348ff.
- *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration. Aspects of Monumental-Art in Byzantium* (London, 1947).
- "Das älteste venezianische Gesellschaftsbild," *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, I (1951), p. 89ff.
- "Der Toskanische Inkrustationsstil und Venedig," *Alte und Neue Kunst*, III, no. 1 (1954), p. 1ff.
- "Die Entstehung des Paläologenstils in der Malerei," *Berichte zum XI. Internat. Byzantinisten-Kongress* (Munich, 1958), IV, 2.

- DEMUS, O. *Die Mosaiken von San Marco in Venedig, 1100-1300* (Baden, 1935).
- "Die Reliefikonen der Westfassade von San Marco: Bemerkungen zur Venezianischen Plastik und Ikonographie des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Jahrbuch der Österr. Byzantin. Gesellschaft*, III (1954), p. 88ff.
- "Frühmittelalterliche Reminiszenzen in San Marco-Venedig," *Atti del II Congresso Intern. di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1953), p. 180ff.
- "The Ciborium Mosaics of Parenzo," *The Burlington Magazine*, LXXXVII (1945), p. 238ff.
- *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily* (London, 1949).
- "Über einige Venezianische Mosaiken des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Belvedere*, X (1931), p. 87ff.
- "Zwei marmorne Altarikonen aus San Marco," *Jahrbuch der Österr. Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, IV (1955), p. 99ff.
- "Zwei Dogengräber in San Marco, Venedig," *ibid.*, V (1956), p. 41ff.
- DEROKO, A. *Monumentalna i dekorativna arhitektura u srednjevekovnoj Srbii* (Belgrade, 1953).
- DE RUBEIS, B. M. *Dissertationes variae eruditionis* (Venice, 1762).
- *Monumenta ecclesiae Aquilejensis* (Venice, 1740).
- DE VERNEILH, F. *L'architecture byzantine en France* (Paris, 1851).
- "Des influences byzantines," *Annales archéologiques*, XIV (1854), pp. 95ff., 174ff., 226ff.
- DE VORAGINE, J. *Legenda Aurea*, ed. Th. Graesse, 3rd ed. (Bratislava, 1890).
- DI CARPEGNA, N. "La 'coperta' della Pala d'oro di Paolo Veneziano," *Bollettino d'arte*, XXXVI, no. 4 (1951), p. 55ff.
- DICLICH, J. *Rito veneto antico detto patriarchino* (Venice, 1824).
- DIEHL, C. *Manuel d'art byzantin*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Paris, 1926).
- M. LE TOURNEAU, and H. SALADIN. *Les monuments chrétiens de Salonique* (Paris, 1918).
- DI PIETRO, F. *I mosaici siciliani dell'eta Normanna* (Palermo, 1946).
- DOERRIES, H. "Das Selbstzeugnis Konstantins des Grossen," *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Phil. Hist. Kl., 3. Folge, no. 34 (Göttingen, 1954).
- DONIN, R. K. "Byzantinische Einflüsse auf den Bau der Markuskirche in Venedig und ihr Weiterwirken im Abendland," *Mitteilungen der Österr. Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, I (1947), p. 3.
- "Die Kirchen Saint-Front in Perigueux und San Marco in Venedig," *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vergleichende Kunstforschung in Wien*, VI, no. 2 (1953), p. 3ff.
- "Österreichische Denkmalpflege in Venedig, 1815-1866," *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vergleichende Kunstforschung in Wien*, VII, no. 2 (1954), p. 1ff.
- "Venezianisches in der mittelalterlichen Baukunst von Wien und Niederösterreich," *Jahrbuch f. Landeskunde von Niederösterreich*, N. F., XXX (1953), p. 189ff.
- *Vincenzo Scamozzi und der Einfluss Venedigs auf die Salzburger Architektur* (Innsbruck-Vienna, 1948).
- DOWNEY, G. "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951), p. 51ff.
- "Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, N. S., XLVII (1957), p. 853ff.
- DRUCE, G. C. "The Mediaeval Bestiaries and Their Influence on Ecclesiastical Arts," *Journal Brit. Archaeol. Association*, XXV (1919), p. 41ff.
- DU CANGE, C. *Historia byzantina duplici commentario illustrata* (Paris, 1680).
- La Ducale Basilica di San Marco*, ed. F. Ongania (Venice, 1886).
- DUCHESNE, L. *L'église au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925).
- DUDAN, B. *Il dominio veneziano di Levante* (Bologna, 1938).
- DURAND, J. "Iconographie et orientation de l'église Saint-Marc à Venise," *Annales archéologiques*, ser. 1, XIV (1854), p. 163.
- "Trésor de l'église Saint-Marc à Venise," *Annales archéologiques*, XX (1860), pp. 165ff., 208ff.
- DÜTSCHKE, H. *Ravennatische Studien* (Leipzig, 1909).

- DVOŘÁK, M. Review of A. Venturi, *Storia dell'arte*, vols. I-III, *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, II (1905), p. 16ff. Reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kunstgeschichte* (Munich, 1929), p. 315ff.
- DVORNIK, F. *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, IV (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).
- EBERSOLT, J. *Constantinople. Recueil d'études d'archéologie et d'histoire* (Paris, 1951).
- *Les arts somptuaires de Byzance* (Paris, 1923).
- *Monuments d'architecture byzantine* (Paris, 1934).
- *Orient et Occident: Recherches sur les influences byzantines et orientales en France avant les Croisades* (Paris-Brussels, 1928).
- *Orient et Occident: Recherches sur les influences byzantines et orientales en France pendant les Croisades* (Paris, 1929).
- EGGER, R. "Der Heilige Hermagoras. Eine kritische Untersuchung," *Carinthia I*, CXXXIV (1947), p. 116ff.; CXXXVII (1948), p. 208ff.
- EICHLER, F. and E. KRIS. *Die Kameen des Kunsthistorischen Museums* (Vienna, 1927).
- EINEM, H. von. "Die Monumentalplastik des Mittelalters und ihr Verhältnis zur Antike," *Antike und Abendland*, III (Hamburg, 1948), p. 120ff.
- EINSTEIN, L. "A Chinese Design in St. Mark's at Venice," *Revue archéologique*, 5^e sér., XXIV (1926), p. 28ff.
- ERMACORA, C. *Il Friuli* (Vicenza, 1935).
- ERRARD, C. and A. GAYET, *L'art byzantin, d'après les monuments de l'Italie, de l'Istrie et de la Dalmatie*; I, *Venise*; II, *Parento*; III, *Ravenne et Pomposa*; IV, *Torcello et la Dalmatie* (Paris, n.d.).
- EVANS, J. *A History of Jewellery, 1100-1780* (London, 1953).
- *Magical Jewels* (Oxford, 1922).
- FABIETTI, A. *Le crociate* (Milan, 1940).
- FANTONI, L. *La cattedra di S. Marco in Venezia, illustrata* (Venice, 1856).
- FERRARI, G. *La terracotta, e pavimenti in laterizio nell'arte italiana* (Milan, 1928).
- FICHTEAU, H. "Byzanz und die Pfalz zu Aachen," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung*, LIX, nos. 1, 2 (1951), p. 1ff.
- "Zum Reliquienwesen im frühen Mittelalter," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung*, LX (1952), p. 60ff.
- FIOCO, G. "Bisanzio, Ravenna e Venezia. Prolusione," *Rivista di Venezia*, IX, no. 2 (1930).
- "La casa Veneziana antica," *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, ser. 8, IV, nos. 1, 2 (1949), p. 38ff.
- "L'arte esarcale lungo le lagune di Venezia," *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, LXXXVII, no. 2 (1937-38).
- "La scultura ad intreccio come filiazione dell'arte esarcale," *ibid.*, XCVIII (1938-39).
- FISKOVIĆ, C. *Radovan. Portal Katedrale u Trogiru* (Zagreb, 1951).
- Florilegium Casinense*, *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, II (Monte Cassino, 1910).
- FONS-MELICOQ, B. DE LA. See DE LA FONS-MELICOQ, B.
- FONTANA, G. J. *Cento palazzi fra i più celebri di Venezia* (Venice, 1865).
- *La piazza S. Marco di Venezia* (Venice, 1867).
- FORCELLA, V. *Iscrizioni cristiane in Milano* (Codogno, 1897).
- FORIATI, F. "Il primo San Marco. Nota preliminare," *Arte veneta*, V (1951), p. 73ff.
- "L'architettura nell'alto Adriatico prima del mille," *Atti III Convegno Nazionale di Storia dell'Architettura* (Rome, 1940), p. 163ff.
- "Nuovi lavori a San Marco," *Arte veneta*, II (1948), p. 159ff.; VI (1952), p. 216.
- "Lavori a San Marco," *ibid.*, IX (1955), p. 241.
- Forschungen in Ephesos, veröffentlicht vom Österr. Archaeol. Institut*, IV, 3, *Die Johanneskirche* (Vienna, 1951).

- FRANCESCHINI, E. "La cronachetta di Maestro Jacopo Dondi," *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, CXIX, no. 2 (1939-40), p. 969 ff.
- FRANCOVICH, G. DE. See DE FRANCOVICH, G.
- FRANZ, H. G. "Transennae als Fensterverschluss, ihre Entwicklung von der frühchristlichen bis zur islamischen Zeit," *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, VIII (1958), p. 65 ff.
- FRASSON, G. "Due importanti basiliche venete e l'architettura cruciforme a cupola," *Ateneo veneto*, CXXXI (1940), p. 160 ff.
- FREY, K. *Le vite de' piu eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architetti, scritte da M. Giorgio Vasari*, etc. I, pt. 1 (Munich, 1911).
- "Ursprung und Entwicklung schwäbischer Kunst in Unteritalien," *Deutsche Rundschau*, LXVIII (1891), p. 270 ff.
- FREY-SALLMANN, A. *Aus dem Nachleben antiker Göttergestalten* (Leipzig, 1931).
- FROLOW, A. *Recherches sur la déviation de la IV^e Croisade vers Constantinople* (Paris, 1955).
- FUCHS, A. "Entstehung und Zweckbestimmung der Westwerke," *Westfälische Zeitschrift*, C (1950), p. 227 ff.
- GABELENTZ, VON DER, H. See VON DER GABELENTZ, H.
- GALANTE, A. "Per la storia giuridica della basilica di San Marco," *Zeitschr. d. Savigny Stiftung f. Rechtsgeschichte*, XXXIII (1912), p. 283 ff.
- GALASSI, G. "I nuovi mosaici scoperti a San Marco in Venezia," *Arte veneta*, IX (1955), p. 342 ff.
- GALLICCIOLI, G. B. *Delle memorie venete antiche profane ed ecclesiastiche* (7 vols.), vol. 3 (Venice, 1795).
- GALLO, R. "Il portico della carta del Palazzo Ducale," *Rivista mensile della Città di Venezia*, XII (1933), p. 15 ff.
- "La tomba di Enrico Dandolo in Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli," *ibid.*, VI (1927), p. 270 ff.
- GANTNER, J., M. POBÉ, and J. ROUBIER. *Gallia romanica* (Vienna-Munich, 1955).
- GARBER, J. *Wirkungen der altchristlichen Gemäldezyklen der St. Peters- und Paulsbasiliken in Rom* (Vienna, 1916).
- GATTINONI, G. R. *Il campanile di San Marco in Venezia* (Venice, 1910; 2nd ed., Venice, 1912).
- GERKE, F. "Das Verhältnis von Malerei und Plastik in der Theodosianisch-Honorianischen Zeit," *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, XII (1935), p. 119 ff.
- GFROERER, A. F. *Geschichte Venedigs von seiner Gründung bis zum Jahre 1084*, Byzantinische Geschichten, I (Graz, 1872).
- GINHART, K. "Karolingische und frühromanische Werkstücke in Kärnten," *Carinthia I*, CXLIV (1954), p. 205 ff.
- GINZEL, F. K. *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1914).
- GIUSTINIAN, B. See JUSTINIANUS, BERNARDUS.
- GLORIA, A. *Codice Diplomatico Padovano*, I (Venice, 1877).
- GOMBOSI, G. "Il piu antico ciclo di mosaici di San Marco," *Dedalo*, XIII, no. 6 (1933), p. 323 ff.
- "Il portico della basilica di San Marco," *Hommage à Alexis Petrovics* (Budapest, 1934), p. 163 ff.
- GOSSELIN, A. *Notice historique et critique de la Ste. Couronne d'épines de N.-S. et sur les autres instruments de la Passion qui se conservent dans l'église métropolitaine de Paris* (Paris, 1828).
- GRABAR, A. "La 'sedia di San Marco' a Venise," *Cahiers archéologiques*, VII (1954), p. 19 ff.
- *L'empereur dans l'art Byzantin* (Paris, 1936).
- "Le trône des martyrs," *Cahiers archéologiques*, VI (1952), p. 32 ff.
- *Martyrium. Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien-antique*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1946).
- "Quelques reliquaires de Saint Démétrios et le martyrium du saint à Salonique," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (1950), p. 1 ff.
- "Saint-Front de Périgueux et le chevet-martyrium," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, XIII, nos. 3, 4 (1947), p. 501 ff.
- "Trônes épiscopaux du XI^e et XII^e siècle en Italie méridionale," *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, XVI (1954), p. 7 ff.

- GRABAR, I. E., ed. *Istoriya russkogo iskusstva*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1953-55).
- GRAEVEN, H. "Der Heilige Markus in Rom und in der Pentapolis," *Römische Quartalschrift*, XIII (1899), p. 109ff.
- "Ein Reliquienkästchen aus Pirano," *Jahrbuch der Kunstsammlungen des AH. Kaiserhauses*, XX (1899), p. 5ff.
- GRÉGOIRE, H. "The Diversion of the Fourth Crusade," *Byzantion*, XV (1951), p. 158ff.
- GROUSSET, R. *L'empire du Levant. Histoire de la question d'Orient* (Paris, 1946).
- GUERIN-BOUTAUD, G. and A. *Les églises romanes de l'ancien diocèse d'Angoulême* (Paris, 1929).
- GUERZONI, G. "San Marco nell'arte e nella storia," *Atti dell'Accademia*, etc. (Padua, 1878), p. 6ff.
- GUIRAND, G. "Le commerce de reliques au commencement du IX^e siècle," *Melanges G. B. Rossi* (Paris-Rome, 1892), p. 73ff.
- GUYER, S. "Beiträge zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des kreuzförmigen basilikalischen Kirchenbaues im Abendland," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Archäologie u. Kunstgeschichte*, VII (1945), p. 73.
- "Der Dom von Pisa und das Rätsel seiner Entstehung," *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* (1932), p. 351ff.
- *Grundlagen mittelalterlicher abendländischer Baukunst. Beiträge zu der vom antiken Tempel zur kreuzförmigen Basilika des abendländischen Mittelalters führenden Entwicklung* (Einsiedeln-Zürich-Cologne, 1950).
- HAHNLOSER, H. R. *Opus Venetum ad filium. Scola et artes cristellariorum de Veneciis, 1284-1319* (Resumé of Lecture at Eighth Int. Congress of History of Art) (Venice, 1955).
- HAIN, A. *Der Doge von Venedig seit dem Sturz der Orseoler 1032 bis zur Ermordung Vitale Michieles II, 1172. Beiträge zur Verfassungsgeschichte des XI u. XII Jahrhunderts* (Königsberg, 1883).
- HAMANN, R. "Altchristliches in der südfranzösischen Protorenaissance des XII. Jahrhunderts," *Die Antike*, X (1934), p. 264ff.
- HAMANN-MCLEAN, R. H. L. "Antikenstudium in der Kunst des Mittelalters," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, XV (1949-50), p. 157ff.
- HÄNSEL, I. "Die Miniaturmalerei einer Paduaner Schule im Dugento," *Jahrbuch der österr. Byzantinischen Gesellschaft*, II (1952), p. 105ff.
- HASELOFF, A. "Die Kaiserinnengräber in Andria. Ein Beitrag zur apulischen Kunstgeschichte unter Friedrich II," *Bibliothek des Preuss. Hist. Inst. in Rom*, I (Rome, 1905).
- *Pre-Romanesque Sculpture in Italy* (Florence-Paris, 1930).
- HASKINS, C. H. *Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1927).
- HAZLITT, W. C. *The Venetian Republic; Its Rise, Its Growth and Its Fall*, I (London, 1900).
- HECKSCHER, W. S. "Relics of Pagan Antiquity in Mediaeval Settings," *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, I (1937-38), p. 204ff.
- HEFELE, K. J. and H. LECLERCQ. *Histoire des Conciles*, I-IV (Paris, 1907-11).
- HEIDENREICH, R. *Das Grabmal Theoderichs zu Ravenna* (Bonn, 1943).
- HEISENBERG, A. *Grabeskirche und Apostelkirche, zwei Basiliken Konstantins*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1908).
- HEYD, W. *Geschichte des Levantehandels im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1879). (French transl. by F. Raynaud, *Histoire du commerce du Levant*, 2 vols. [Leipzig, 1936]).
- Historia de Translatione Sanctorum Nicolai, terra marique miraculis gloriosi, eiusdem avunculi, alterius Nicolai Theodorique, martyris pretiosi*, etc. *Recueil des historiens des Croisades, historiens occidentaux*, V (Paris, 1895), p. 253ff.
- HODGSON, F. C. *The Early History of Venice* (London, 1901).
- *Venice in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (London, 1910).
- HOLMES, U. T. "Mediaeval Gem Stones," *Speculum*, IX (1934), p. 195ff.
- HÖRMANN, H. "Die Johannes Kirche in Ephesus und ihre Ausgrabung," *Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und Christlichen Archäologie*, I, no. 1 (Baden-Baden, 1952), p. 77ff.
- HORN, W. "Romanesque Churches in Florence: A Study in Their Chronology and Stylistic Development," *Art Bulletin*, XXV (1943), p. 112ff.
- HÜBSCH, H. *Die altchristlichen Kirchen* (Karlsruhe, 1863).
- HUTTON, E. *The Cosmati* (London, 1950).

- Il campanile di San Marco, ri-edificato. Studi, ricerche, relazioni, a cura del comune di Venezia*, 2nd ed. (Venice, 1912).
- IVEKOVIĆ, C. M. *Dalmatien's Architektur u. Plastik, I, Traù* (Vienna, n. d.).
- JACOBUS DE VORAGINE. See DE VORAGINE, J.
- JAEGER, R. "Der Ring des Meeres," *Repertorium f. Kunstwissenschaft*, LI (1930), p. 232 ff.
- JANIN, R. "Les églises byzantines de saints militaires: Constantinople et banlieue," *Echos d'Orient*, XXXVIII (1935), p. 56 ff.
- *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin, I: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarchat oecuménique, 3: Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1953).
- "Les sanctuaires de Byzance sous la domination latine, 1204-1261," *Revue des études byzantines*, II (1944), p. 134 ff.
- "Les sanctuaires des colonies latines à Constantinople," *ibid.*, IV (1946), p. 163 ff.
- JENKINS, R. J. H. and C. A. MANGO, "The Date and Significance of the Tenth Homily of Photius," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 9-10 (1955-56), p. 125 ff.
- JEWELL, H. H. and F. W. Hasluck. *The Church of Our Lady of the Hundred Gates (Panagia Hekatonapyliani) in Paros* (London, 1920).
- JOPPI, V. "Le sacre reliquie della chiesa patriarchale di Aquileja. Memorie e documenti," *Archivio storico per Trieste, l'Istria e il Trentino*, III, nos. 3, 4 (1886), p. 195 ff.
- JULLIAN, R. "Les survivances antiques dans la sculpture lombarde au XIII^e siècle," *Etudes italiennes*, N. S., I (1931), pp. 131 ff., 217 ff.
- *L'éveil de la sculpture italienne. I, La sculpture romane dans l'Italie du nord* (Paris, 1945).
- JUSTINIANUS, BERNARDUS. "De divi Marci Evangelistae vita eiusque translatione," in J. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus antiquitatum et historiae Italiae*, V, pt. 1 (Leyden, 1733).
- *De origine urbis Venetiarum . . . libri quindecim . . . Adjecta insuper Divi Marci Evangelistae vita ac eius translatio* (Venice, 1534).
- KALLIGAS, M. "Οἱ Πέσσοι τῆς Πτολεμαίδος," *Ἀρχαιολ. Ἐφημερίς*, 77 (1938), p. 70 ff.
- KANIUTH, A. "Die Beisetzung Konstantins des Grossen," *Breslauer Historische Forschungen*, XVIII (1941).
- KANTOROWICZ, E. "Ivories and Litanies," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, V (1942), p. 56 ff.
- *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite*, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1928).
- *Laudes Regiae* (Berkeley-Los Angeles, 1946).
- KATTERBACH, B. "Le miniature dell'Epistolario di Padova dell'anno 1259," *Codices ex ecclesiasticis Italiae bibliothecis delecti*, V (Vatican City, 1932).
- KATZENELLENBOGEN, A. *Allegories of Virtues and Vices in Mediaeval Art* (London, 1939).
- "The Sarcophagus in S. Ambrogio and St. Ambrose," *Art Bulletin*, XXIX (1947), p. 249 ff.
- KAUTZSCH, R. "Die Langobardische Schmuckkunst in Oberitalien," *Römisches Jahrbuch f. Kunstgeschichte*, V (1941), p. 1 ff.
- "Die römische Schmuckkunst in Stein vom 6. bis zum 10. Jahrhundert," *ibid.*, III (1939), p. 1 ff.
- KECK, A. S. "A Group of Italo-Byzantine Ivories," *Art Bulletin*, XII (1930), p. 147 ff.
- KEHR, P. F. *Italia Pontificia*, VII, pts. 1, 2 (Berlin, 1923-25).
- "Rom und Venedig bis ins XII. Jahrhundert," *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, XIX (Rome, 1927).
- KELLER, H. "Die Entstehung des Bildnisses am Ende des Hochmittelalters," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 3 (1939), p. 227 ff.
- *Giovanni Pisano* (Vienna, 1942).
- KIESLINGER, F. "Le transenne della basilica di San Marco del secolo XIII," *Ateneo veneto*, CXXXI (1944), p. 57 ff.
- "Unbekanntes am bekanntesten Orte: Deutung des einzig erhaltenen Lünetten-Mosaiks an der Front des Markusdoms über der Porta Alipio," *Festschrift Prof. Dr. J. Anselm Weissenhofer* (Vienna, 1954), p. 57 ff.

- KITZINGER, E. "The Horse and Lion Tapestry at Dumbarton Oaks," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 3 (1946), p. 1 ff.
- "The Mosaics of the Cappella Palatina in Palermo. An Essay on the Choice and Arrangement of Subjects," *Art Bulletin*, XXXI (1949), p. 269 ff.
- "On the Portrait of Roger II in the Martorana in Palermo," *Proporzioni*, no. 3 (1950), p. 30 ff.
- KLEBEL, E. "Zur Geschichte der Patriarchen von Aquileja," *Beiträge zur älteren europäischen Kulturgeschichte (Festschrift für Rudolf Egger)*, I (Klagenfurt, 1952), p. 396 ff.
- KLUGE, T. and K. LEHMANN-HARTLEBEN. *Die Römischen Grossbronzen*, 2 vols. (Berlin-Leipzig, 1927).
- KOCH, C. "Antike Rosse und Löwen zu Venedig," *Deutsche Rundschau*, XVIII, no. 9 (1892).
- KOLLWITZ, J. *Oströmische Plastik der Theodosianischen Zeit* (Berlin, 1941).
- KONDAKOV, N. P. *Ikongrafiya Bogomateri*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1914-15).
- KOSELEFF, O. *Die Monatsdarstellungen der französischen Plastik des XIII. Jahrhunderts* (Marburg, 1934).
- KRAUTHEIMER, R. "Introduction to an Iconography of Mediaeval Architecture," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, V (1942), p. 1 ff.
- "The Carolingian Revival of Early Christian Architecture," *Art Bulletin*, XXIV (1952), p. 1 ff.
- "San Nicola in Bari und die Apulische Architectur des 12. Jahrhunderts," *Wiener Jahrbuch f. Kunstgeschichte*, IX (1934), p. 16 ff.
- "Zur venezianischen Trecentoplastik," *Marburger Jahrbuch f. Kunstwissenschaft*, V (1929), p. 193 ff.
- KRAUTHEIMER-HESS, T. "Die figurale Plastik der Ostlombardei von 1100-1178," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, IV (1928), p. 231 ff.
- KRETSCHMAYR, H. *Geschichte von Venedig*, 3 vols. (Gotha-Stuttgart, 1905, 1920, 1934).
- KROLL, J. "Gott und Hölle," *Studien der Bibl. Warburg*, XX (1932).
- KVET, J. "Un reflet de l'art venitien dans la sculpture en Bohême vers la fin du XIII^e ou au début du XIV^e siècle," *XVIII Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art* (Venice, 1955), résumé no. 96.
- LADENDORF, H. "Antikenstudium und Antikenkopien. Vorarbeiten zu einer Darstellung ihrer Bedeutung in der mittelalterlichen und neueren Zeit," *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, phil. hist. Kl.*, XLVI, no. 2 (1953).
- LADNER, G. "Die mittelalterliche Reformidee und ihr Verhältnis zur Renaissance," *Mitteilungen des österr. Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, LX (1951), p. 31 ff.
- LAMBROS, S. *Catalogue illustré de la collection de portraits des empereurs de Byzance* (Athens, 1911).
- LANCKORŃSKI, K. *Der Dom von Aquileja, sein Bau und seine Geschichte*. Unter Mitwirkung von G. Niemann und H. Swoboda, herausgegeben v. K. G. L. (Vienna, 1906).
- LANZONI, F. *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini fino al principio del secolo VII. Studio critico, Studi e Testi* (Rome, 1927).
- *Le origini delle diocesi antiche d'Italia, Studi e Testi*, 35 (Rome, 1923).
- LASAREFF, V. N. *Istoriya vizantiyskoy zhivopisi*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1948).
- "Novyi pamyatnik stankovoy zhivopisi XII v. i obraz Georgiya -voyna v vizantiyskom i drevnerusskom iskusstve," *Vizant. Vremennik*, VI (1953), p. 186 ff.
- "Studies in the Iconography of the Virgin," *Art Bulletin*, XX, no. 1 (1938), p. 27 ff.
- LASTEYRIE, R. DE. See DE LASTEYRIE, R.
- LAWRENCE, M. "A Gothic Reworking of an Early Christian Sarcophagus," *Art Studies*, VII (1929), p. 89 ff.
- *The Sarcophagi of Ravenna*, College Art Association of America, Monographs, II (1945).
- "Two Ravennate Monuments in American Collections," *Studies in Art and Literature for Belle da Costa Greene* (Princeton, 1954), p. 132 ff.
- LAZAREV, V. N. See LASAREFF, V. N.

- LAZZARINI, V. "Il pretesto documento della fondazione di Venezia e la Cronaca del medico Jacopo Dondi," *Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, LXXV (1915-16), pp. ii, 1263ff.; reprinted in: *idem, Scritti di paleografia e diplomatica* (Venice, 1938), p. 99ff.
- "Il testamento del Doge Andrea Dandolo," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, N. S., VII, no. 1 (1904), p. 139ff.
- "I titoli dei dogi di Venezia," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, N. S., V, no. 2 (1903), p. 271ff.
- LE BLANT, E. *Le vol des reliques* (Paris, 1887).
- LEGRAND, E. "Description des oeuvres d'art et de l'église des Saints Apôtres de Constantinople. Poème en vers iambiques par Constantin le Rhodien," *Revue des études grecques*, IX (1896), p. 32ff.
- LEHMANN-BROCKHAUS, O. *Schriftquellen zur Kunstgeschichte des 11. u. 12. Jahrhunderts für Deutschland, Lothringen und Italien* (Berlin, 1938).
- "Die Kanzeln der Abruzzern im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, VI (1942-44), p. 257ff.
- LEICHT, P. S. "La chiesa di Aquileia e l'Impero," in: P. S. Leicht, *Studi e frammenti* (Udine, 1903).
- LEMERLE, P. "A propos d'une basilique de Thasos et de Saint-Jean d'Ephèse," *Byzantion*, XXIII (1953), p. 531ff.
- LENEL, W. *Die Entstehung der Vorherrschaft Venedigs in der Adria* (Strasbourg, 1897).
- "Venezianisch-istrische Studien," *Schriften der Wissenschaftl. Gesellschaft in Strassburg*, IX (Strasbourg, 1911).
- LENTZ, E. *Das Verhältnis Venedigs zu Byzanz nach dem Fall des Exarchats bis zum Ausgang des IX. Jhdts. I, Venedig als Byzantinische Provinz* (Berlin, 1891).
- "Der allmähliche Übergang Venedigs von faktischer zu nomineller Abhängigkeit von Byzanz," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, III (1894), p. 64ff.
- LE ROUZIC, L. *Le trésor de Notre-Dame de Paris* (Paris, 1951).
- LEVI, D. "The Allegories of the Months in Classical Art," *Art Bulletin*, XXIII (1941), p. 287ff.
- LIKHACHEV, N. *Istoricheskoye znachenie italo-grecheskoy ikonopisi* (St. Petersburg, 1911).
- LIPSIUS, R. A. *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 2 vols. (Braunschweig, 1883-87).
- Litaniae secundum consuetudinem ducalis ecclesiae Sancti Marci Venetiarum* (Venice, 1719).
- LOEFFLER, E. "Lysippos' Labors of Herakles," *Marsyas*, VI (1950-53), p. 8ff.
- LÖFFLER, K. *Der Landgrafenpsalter. Eine Bilderhandschrift aus dem Anfang des XIII. Jahrhunderts in der Württembergischen Landesbibliothek* (Leipzig, 1925).
- LONGHURST, M. H. *Carvings in Ivory* (Victoria and Albert Museum) I, (London, 1927).
- LONGNON, J. *L'empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris, 1949).
- LONIGO, G. *Sul patronato del Doge di Venezia sulla chiesa di San Marco* (Venice, 1865).
- LOOMIS, R. S. "Alexander the Great's Celestial Journey," *The Burlington Magazine*, XXXII (1918), pp. 136ff., 177ff.
- "The Treatment in Art of Alexander the Great's Celestial Journey," *American Journal of Archaeology*, ser. 2, XX (1916), p. 80f.
- LORENZETTI, G. "La Pala d'oro di S. Marco," *Italia*, N. S., III (Oct.-Dec. 1943), p. 21ff.
- *San Marco. Estratto da Venezia e il suo estuario*. Edizione aggiornata, 1952 (Venice, 1952).
- *Torcello, la sua storia, i suoi monumenti* (Venice, 1940).
- "Un prototipo Veneto-Bizantino del Palazzo Ducale di Venezia," *Miscellanea di Storia dell' arte in onore di I. B. Supino* (Florence, 1933), p. 23ff.
- *Venezia e il suo estuario* (Venice, 1926).
- LUCCHESI-PALLI, E. *Die Passions- und Endszenen Christi auf der Ciboriumssäule v. S. Marco in Venedig* (Prague, 1942).
- LUCIUS, E. *Les origines du culte des saints dans l'église chrétienne* (Paris, 1908).
- MACCHIETTA, F. *De divino officio commentarius historico-theologicus* (Venice, 1739).
- MÂLE, E. *L'art religieux du XII^e siècle en France*, 5th ed. (Paris, 1922).
- *L'art religieux du XIII^e siècle en France*, 5th ed. (Paris, 1923).

- MÂLE, E. *Religious Art from the Twelfth to the Eighteenth Century* (London-New York, 1949).
- MAMBOURY, E. *Istanbul touristique* (Istanbul, 1951).
- "Topographie de Ste.-Sophie. Le sanctuaire et la solea, le mitatorion, le puits sacré," etc., *Studi Bizantini e Neellenici*, VI (Atti V Congresso Internaz. di Studi Bizantini, II) (Rome, 1940), p. 197ff.
- MANFREDI, F. *Dignità Procuratoria di S. Marco di Venetia* (Venice, 1602).
- MANFREDI, M. *Basilica di S. Marco in Venezia: Direzione dei restauri e dello studio di mosaico. Le condizioni statiche della Basilica* (Venice, 1904).
- and L. MARANGONI, *Le opere di restauro nella basilica [di S. Marco in Venezia], Direzione dei restauri e dello studio di mosaico* (Venice, 1908).
- MANIN, L. *Memorie storico-critiche intorno la vita, translazione, e invenzioni di San Marco Evangelista, principale protettore di Venezia*, 1st ed. (Venice, 1815); 2nd ed. (Venice, 1835).
- MANITIUS, M. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911-31).
- MANSI, G. D. *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence-Venice, 1759-98).
- MARANGONI, L. "Conservazione della scultura ornamentale in San Marco," *Rivista di Venezia*, XII, no. 2 (Feb. 1933), p. 51ff.
- *La basilica di S. Marco a Venezia. Urgenza di provvedimenti per la sua conservazione* (Venice, 1946).
- "L'architetto ignoto di San Marco," Estratto da *Archivio veneto*, ser. 5, XIII (1933).
- "Un infisso liturgico del tesoro di S. Marco," *Atti del Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti*, LXXXVI, pt. 2. (1926-27), p. 1113ff.
- MARCHETTI-LONGHI, G. "Il patriarcato di Aquileia, il Papato e l'impero fino alla prima metà del sec. XIII," *N. Archivio veneto*, N. S., XXXI (1916), p. 5ff.
- MARIACHER, G. "Appunti per un profilo della scultura gotica Veneziana," *Atti dell'Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti* (Classe di scienze morali e lettere), CLX (1951), pp. 225ff., 237ff.
- "Capitelli Veneziani del XII e XIII secolo," *Arte veneta*, VIII (1954), p. 43ff.
- "Postilla al' S. Teodoro, statua composita," *Arte veneta*, I (1947), p. 230ff.
- and T. PIGNATTI. *S. Marco di Venezia* (Florence, 1950).
- MARLE, R. VAN. See VAN MARLE, R.
- MARZEMIN, G. "Le origini di Venezia e i metodi degli storici." Estratto da *Ateneo veneto* (Venice, 1937).
- *Le origini romane di Venezia* (Venice, 1937).
- MATTHIAE, G. "Componenti del gusto decorativo cosmatesco," *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte*, N. S., I (1952), p. 249ff.
- MAURER, E. *Die Kunstdenkmäler des Kantons Aargau*, III, *Das Kloster Königsfelden* (Basel, 1954).
- MC CLEARY, N. "Note storiche ed archeologiche sul testo della *translatio Sancti Marci*," transl. by Cecchelli. *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, XXVII-XXIX (1931-33), p. 223ff.
- MEREGAZZI, M. *La chiesa di San Marco nella storia e nell'arte* (Milan, 1937).
- MESCHINELLO, G. *La chiesa ducale di S. Marco, colle notizie del suo inalzamento, spiegazione delli mosaici e delle iscrizioni*, etc., 3 vols. (Venice, 1753).
- MEYER, W. "Die Spaltung des Patriarchats Aquileia," *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, N. S., II (1898).
- MILLER, E. *Manuelis Philae Carmina*, I (Paris, 1855).
- MILLER, W. *Essays on the Latin Orient* (London, 1921).
- MILLET, G. *L'ancien art serbe* (Paris, 1919).
- "L'Ascension d'Alexandre," *Syria*, IV (1923), p. 85ff.
- MILLIKEN, W. M. "Exhibition of Gold," *The Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, XXXIV, no. 9 (1947).
- MILLINGEN, A. VAN. See VAN MILLINGEN, A.
- MOLINIER, E. *L'émaillerie* (Paris, 1891).
- *Le trésor de la basilique de Saint Marc à Venise* (Venice, 1888).
- MOLINUS, A. *De vita et lipsanis S. Marci Evangelistae*, ed. S. Pieralisi, II (Rome, 1864).
- MOLMENTI, P. *La dogaressa di Venezia*, 2nd ed. (Turin, 1887).

- MOLMENTI, P. *La storia di Venezia nella vita privata*, 4th ed., 4 vols. (Bergamo, 1905-08).
- MONTEVERDE, A. "Il concilio di Mantova, 827," *Forumjuli*, III (1912), pp. 1ff, 65ff.
- MONTICOLO, G. "Cronache Veneziane antichissime," I, II, *Fonti per la storia d'Italia, Scrittori* (Rome, 1890).
- "I capitolari delle arti Veneziane sottoposte alla giustizia, dalle origini al 1330," *Fonti per la storia d'Italia*, XXVI, XXVII (Rome, 1896, 1905).
- "La cronaca di Giovanni Diacono e la storia politica di Venezia fino al 1109," *Archivio veneto*, XXV (1883), p. 1ff.
- "La inventio e la translatio dei SS. Ermagora e Fortunato (nel cod. Marc. lat. X, 37)," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, III, pt. 1 (1892), p. 117ff.
- "L'apparition Scti Marci ed i suoi manoscritti," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, IX (1895), pp. 111, 475ff.
- "L'arte dei fiolieri a Venezia nel sec. XIII e nel principio del XIV e i suoi più antichi statuti," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, I (1891), pp. 137ff., 317ff.
- "Marin Sanudo, le vite dei Dogi," see SANUDO, M.
- "Studi e ricerche per l'edizione dei capitolari antichissimi delle arti veneziane, 1219-1330," *Bullettino dell'Istituto storico Ital.*, XIII (1893).
- and E. BESTA. *I capitolari delle arti veneziane* (Rome, 1914).
- MORAND, J. *Histoire de la Sainte Chapelle Royale du Palais* (Paris, 1790).
- MOREL d'ARLEUX, L. "Les tribulations des chevaux de Venise," *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie des XII^e et XV^e arrondissements de Paris*, XXXIV (1933-34), p. 373ff.
- MOREY, C. R. "The Early Christian Ivories of the Eastern Empire," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 1 (1941), p. 41ff.
- MOROSINI, A. *Andreae Mauroceni... opusculum cum eiusdem epistolis pars prima... De sacris lipsanis in D. Marci templo inventis...* (Venice, 1625).
- MOROZZO DELLA ROCCA, R. and A. LOMBARDO. *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI-XIII*, I (Turin, 1940).
- MORTET, V. and P. DESCHAMPS. *Recueil des textes relatifs à l'histoire de l'architecture et à la condition des architectes en France au moyen âge*, II (Paris, 1929).
- MOSTO, A. DA. See DA MOSTO, A.
- MOTHES, O. *Geschichte der Baukunst und Bildhauerei Venedigs*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1859-60).
- MÜFID, A. "Erwerbungsbericht des Antikenmuseums zu Istanbul seit 1914," *Archaeol. Anzeiger* (1931), p. 195f.
- MURATORI, L. A. *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, XII, (Milan, 1728), = *Andreae Danduli Venetorum Ducis Cronicon Venetum*, see DANDOLO, A.
- MUSATTI, E. *Storia della promissione ducale* (Venice, 1888).
- MUSOLINO, A. *La Basilica di San Marco* (Venice, 1955).
- NEUMANN, C. "Die Markuskirche in Venedig," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, LXIX, LXX (1892), pp. 612ff., 737ff.
- "Über die urkundlichen Quellen zur Geschichte der Byzantinisch-Venezianischen Beziehungen im Zeitalter der Komnenen," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, I (1892), p. 366ff.
- NICCO FASOLA, G. "L'antico portale di Santa Giustina di Padova," *Arte veneta*, VIII (1954), p. 49ff.
- Officium hebdomadae sanctae secundum consuetudinem ducalis Ecclesiae S. Marci Venetiarum* (Venice, 1716).
- OKUNEV, N. L. "Altarnaya pregrada XII veka v Nerese," *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, III (1929), p. 5ff.
- ONGANIA, F., ed. *La Ducale Basilica*, See *La Ducale Basilica*, etc.
- ed. *Raccolta delle vere da pozzo in Venezia* (Venice, 1889).
- ORLANDOS, A. K. *Ἡ ξυλόστεγος παλαιοχριστιανικὴ βασιλικὴ τῆς μεσογειακῆς λεκάνης*, I, II (Athens, 1952-53).

- ORLANDOS, A. K. "Ἡ σταυρική βασιλικὴ τῆς Θάσου," *Ἀρχεῖον τῶν Βυζαντινῶν μνημείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, VII (1951), p. 3 ff.
- "Νέον ἀνάγλυφον τῆς ἀναλήψεως τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου," *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἑπετηρὶς τῆς Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς τοῦ Πανεπιστημίου* (1954-55), p. 281 ff.
- OSTENDORF, A. "Das Salvatorpatrozinium, seine Anfänge und seine Ausbreitung im mittelalterlichen Deutschland," *Westfälische Zeitschrift*, C (1950), p. 357 ff.
- OTTINO DELLA CHIESA, A. "Gli avori delle collezioni Lombarde alla Mostra di Zurigo," *Bollettino d'arte*, XXXV (1949), p. 253 ff.
- PAATZ, W. "Die Hauptströmungen in der Florentiner Baukunst des frühen und hohen Mittelalters und ihr geschichtlicher Hintergrund," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz*, VI (1940), p. 33 ff.
- "Renaissance oder Renovatio? Ein Problem der Begriffsbildung in der Kunstgeschichte des Mittelalters," *Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters*. Vorträge der 1. Deutschen Kunsthistorikertagung auf Schloss Brühl, 1948 (Berlin, 1950), p. 16 ff.
- PAESELER, W. "Der Rückgriff der römischen Spätdugentmalerei auf die christliche Spätantike," *Beiträge zur Kunst des Mittelalters*. Vorträge der 1. Deutschen Kunsthistorikertagung auf Schloss Brühl, 1948 (Berlin, 1950), p. 157 ff.
- PALLUCCHINI, R. *I mesi marciali* (Milan, 1944).
- PANOFSKY, E. "Renaissance and Renascences," *Kenyon Review*, VI, no. 2 (1944), p. 201 ff.
- and F. SAXL. "Classical Mythology in Mediaeval Art," *Metropolitan Museum Studies*, IV (1932-33), p. 228 ff.
- PAOLETTI, P. *Nuovi ritocchi alla storia della chiesa di S. Marco* (Venice, 1905).
- *L'architettura e la scultura del rinascimento in Venezia* (Venice, 1893-97).
- PAPADOPOLI, N. A. "Enrico Dandolo e le sue monete," *Rivista italiana di numismatica*, III, no. 4 (1890).
- *Il leone di San Marco. Pensieri ed osservazioni di un numismatico* (Venice, 1921).
- *Le monete di Venezia*, I (Venice, 1893).
- PARGOIRE, J. "Autour de Chalcédoine," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XI (1902), p. 333 ff.
- "Environs de Chalcédoine," *Echos d'Orient*, I (1897-98), p. 145 ff.
- "Hieria," *Izvestiya Imperat. Russkago Arkheol. Instituta v Konstant.*, IV (1899), p. 9 ff.
- "Rufinians," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VIII (1899), p. 428 ff.
- PASCHINI, P. "I patriarchi di Aquileia nel sec. XII," *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, X (1914), p. 1 ff.
- *La chiesa aquileiese ed il periodo delle origini* (Udine, 1909).
- "Le fasi di una leggenda aquileiese," *Rivista di storia della chiesa in Italia*, VII (1954), p. 161 ff.
- "Le vicende politiche e religiose del Friuli nei sec. IX e X," *Nuovo archivio veneto*, N. S., X (1910), p. 201 ff.
- "Le vicende politiche e religiose del territorio friulano da Costantino a Carlo Magno (secc. IV-VIII)," *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, VII (1911), p. 177 ff.; VIII (1912), pp. 49 ff., 152 ff., 233 ff.; IX (1913), p. 1 ff.
- "Note sull'origine della chiesa di Concordia e sul culto agli Apostoli nell'Italia settentrionale alla fine del secolo IV," *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, VII (1911), p. 9 ff.
- "Note storiche su uomini ed avvenimenti del Friuli in sul caddere del regno Longobardo," *Memorie storiche Forogiuliesi*, VIII (1912), p. 1 ff.
- *San Paolino Patriarca e la chiesa aquileiese alla fine del sec. VIII* (Udine, 1906).
- "Sulle origini della chiesa di Aquileia," *Rivista di scienze storiche*, I (1904), pp. 24 ff., 123 ff., 187 ff., 283 ff., 352 ff.
- "Vicende del Friuli durante il dominio della casa imperiale di Franconia," *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, IX (1913), pp. 15 ff., 176 ff.
- PASINI, A. "Due iscrizioni Romane a S. Marco. (Lettera al Prof. Rinaldo Fulin)." Estratto da *Archivio veneto*, XX, no. I (1880).
- *Guide de la basilique de St. Marc à Venise* (Schio, 1888).

- PASINI, A. *Il tesoro di S. Marco in Venezia*, 2 vols. (Venice, 1885-86).
 ——— "Quale sia il vero anno della consecrazione della basilica di S. Marco." Estratto dal giornale *La difesa*, XIX, no. 40.
- PASQUI, U. *Documenti per la storia della città di Arezzo*, I (Florence, 1899).
- PAULUS DIACONUS. *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* (ed. Pertz), Monumenta Germaniae. Historica, *Scriptores*, II, pp. 260-270. Migne, PL., XCV, p. 699ff.
- PAVANELLO, G. "San Marco nella leggenda e nella storia." Estratto da *Rivista della città di Venezia* (1928), p. 293ff.
- PEIRCE, H. and R. TYLER. *L'art byzantin*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1932-34).
 ——— "Three Byzantine Works of Art," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 2 (1941), p. 3ff.
- PERKINS, J. B. WARD. See WARD PERKINS, J. B.
- PETERSON, E. *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem* (Leipzig, 1935).
- PEYER, H. C. "Stadt und Stadtpatron im mittelalterlichen Italien (Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft, Staat)," *Zürcher Studien zur allgemeinen Geschichte*, XIII (Zurich, 1955).
- PIAZZA, G. *La R. Basilica di S. Marco esposta in sei tavole . . . da Ant. Lazzari . . . Descritta in due lingue italiana e francese da G. P.* (Venice, 1835).
- PIETRO, F. DI. See DI PIETRO, F.
- PINALI, G. *Promemoria a Mons. Rev. Bonsignori, Patriarca di Venezia, per invitarlo ad una pronta e facile perlustrazione necessaria nel tempio di S. Marco, Venezia, 1812* (Venice, 1882).
- PLANISCIG, L. *Die Estensische Kunstsammlung. I: Skulpturen und Plastiken des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Vienna, 1919).
 ——— "Geschichte der venezianischen Skulptur im 14. Jahrhundert," *Jahrbuch der Kunstsammlungen des AH Kaiserhauses*, XXXIII (1916), p. 31ff.
- POLLAK, L. and A. MUÑOZ. *Pièces de choix de la collection du comte Grégoire Stroganoff à Rome*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1911-12).
- PORTER, A. KINGSLEY. *Lombard Architecture*, 4 vols. (New Haven, 1915-17).
- PRAGA, G. *Storia di Dalmazia, I. Dall'impero di Roma alla signoria di Venezia* (Zara, 1941).
- PREGER, TH., ed. *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1901-07).
- PROSDOCIMI, A. "Le porte antiche dell'atrio di San Marco a Venezia," *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rendiconti della classe di scienze morali*, etc., ser. 8, II, nos. 11-12 (1947), p. 529ff.
Psalterium ad usum ecclesiae S. Marci Venetiarum (Venice, 1609).
- PUIG I CADAFAELCH, J. "More Decorative Forms of the First Romanesque Style. Polychromy and Sculpture," *Art Studies*, VIII, pt. 2 (1931), p. 75ff.
- PUPIN, M. *Dečani*. Monumenta Serbica artis mediaevalis, bk. II, 2 vols. (Belgrade, 1941).
- RAMBALDI, P. L. *Mostra storico-artistica del campanile di S. Marco, Catalogo* (Venice, 1912).
- RASETTI, G. *Il calendario nell'arte italiana* (Pescara, 1941).
- RATHGENS, H. *San Donato in Murano und ähnliche venezianische Bauten* (Berlin, 1903).
- RAVE, P. O. *Der Emporenbau in romanischer und frühgotischer Zeit* (Bonn-Leipzig, 1924).
- RÉAU, L. *Iconographie de l'art chrétien, I, Introduction générale* (Paris, 1955).
- REINACH, T. "Commentaire archéologique sur le poème de Constantin le Rhodien," *Revue des études grecques*, IX (1896), p. 66ff.
- RIANT, P. E. D. *Des dépouilles religieuses enlevées à Constantinople au XIII^e siècle par les Latins* (Paris, 1875).
 ——— *Exuviae sacrae Constantinopolitanae*, I, II (Geneva, 1875); III (Paris, 1904).
- RICE, D. S. "The Seasons and the Labors of the Month in Islamic Art," *Ars orientalis*, I (1954), p. 1ff.
- RICE, D. T. *Byzantine Art* (Oxford, 1935).
 ——— "The Leaved Cross," *Byzantinoslavica*, XI, no. 1 (1950), p. 72ff.
- RICHTER, J. P. *Quellen der Byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte* (Vienna, 1897).
- RIEGER, R. "Der Santo zu Padua," *Christliche Kunstblätter*, XCIII (1955), pp. 64ff., 141ff.
- ROBERTI, M. *Ricerche intorno alla colonia Veneziana in Costantinopoli nel secolo XII* (Padua, 1925).

- ROBERTSON, A. *The Bible of St. Mark's Church. The Altar and Throne of Venice* (London, 1898).
- ROMANIN, S. *Storia documentata di Venezia*, 10 vols. (Venice, 1853-61).
- ROOSVAL, J. "Proto-Renaissance at the End of the Twelfth Century," *Beiträge für G. Swarzenski* (Berlin, 1951), p. 39ff.
- ROSSI, A, ed. "La cronaca dei Veneziani del Maestro Martino da Canale nell'antico francese colla corrispondente versione italiana del Conte Giovanni Galvani," etc. *Archivio storico ital.*, VIII (1845), p. 270ff.
- "La cronaca Veneta detta Altinate," *ibid.*, VIII (1845), p. 1ff.
- *Studi di storia politico-ecclesiastica di Venezia anteriore al mille* (Bologna, 1901).
- ROSSI, G. and G. SALERNI. *I capitelli del Palazzo ducale di Venezia* (Venice, 1952).
- ROUX, J. *La basilique de Saint-Front de Périgueux* (Périgueux, 1920).
- RUBEIS, B. M. DE. See DE RUBEIS, B. M.
- RUSKIN, J. *St. Mark's Rest*, 2nd ed. (London, 1894).
- SACCARDO, F. *Il campanile di San Marco. Indagini storiche* (Venice, 1912).
- *Il primo campanile di S. Marco nella sua forma bizantina* (Venice, 1912).
- SACCARDO, G. "I pilastri acritani," *Archivio veneto*, XXXIV (1887), p. 285ff.
- "L'antica chiesa di S. Teodoro in Venezia," *Archivio veneto*, XXXIV (1887), p. 91ff.
- SACCARDO, P. *I restauri della basilica di San Marco a Venezia nell'ultimo decennio* (Venice, 1890-92).
- *I restauri della basilica di S. Marco in Venezia dall'agosto del 1890 a tutto l'anno 1891* (Venice, 1892).
- *La basilica di San Marco e il suo pavimento* (Venice, 1901).
- *La cappella di S. Isidoro nella basilica di San Marco, con la storia del santo martire di Chio e della traslazione delle sue reliquie a Venezia*, etc. (Venice, 1887).
- *Les mosaïques de St. Marc à Venise* (Venice, 1897).
- "Relazione intorno ai principali lavori che furono eseguiti nella basilica di San Marco in Venezia durante l'anno 1885 e proposte per quelli da farsi nell'anno 1886," *Archivio veneto*, XXXI (1886), p. 499ff.
- *Sommario dei lavori eseguiti nella basilica di S. Marco in Venezia dal principio dell'anno 1892 a tutto l'agosto del 1895* (Venice, 1895).
- SAGREDO, A. and F. BERCHET. *Il fondaco dei Turchi in Venezia. Studi storici ed artistici* (Venice, 1860).
- Sainte Sophie d'Ochrida. Musées et monuments*, IV (Paris: Unesco, 1953).
- SALMI, M. "A proposito di arte 'esarcale,'" *Le arti*, XX (1941-42), pp. 44-47.
- "Arte romanica fiorentina," *L'arte*, XVII (1914), pp. 265ff., 369ff.
- *L'abbazia di Pomposa*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1936).
- "La genesi del duomo di Pisa," *Bollettino d'arte*, ser. 3, XXXII, no. 4 (1938), p. 149ff.
- *L'architettura romanica in Toscana* (Milan-Rome, 1939).
- SAMBON, A. "L'Hercule anteportanus de la basilique de St. Marc à Venise," *Le musée*, VIII (1925), p. 29ff.
- SANSOVINO, F. *Venetia, città nobilissima et singolare, descritta in XIII libri* (Venice, 1581); 2nd ed. (Venice, 1604).
- SANTALENA, A. *Leoni di San Marco* (Venice, 1906).
- SANTI, A. "Origine dell'arte vetraria in Venezia e Murano," *Voce di Murano* (Venice, 1885).
- SANTIFALLER, L. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des lateinischen Patriarchats von Konstantinopel (1204-1261) und der Venezianischen Urkunde* (Weimar, 1938).
- SANUDO, MARINO. *Le vite dei dogi*, ed. G. Monticolo, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* (Città di Castello, 1900).
- SARPI, P. *Discorso dell'origine, forma, leggi ed uso dell'Ufficio dell'Inquisizione in Venezia* (Venice, 1939).
- *Il dominio dell'Adriatico* (a cura di R. Cessi) (Padua, 1943).
- SARTON, G. *Introduction to the History of Science* (Baltimore, 1931).
- SARTORIO, L. "San Teodoro, statua composita," *Arte veneta*, I (1947), p. 132ff.

- SAUER, J. *Symbolik des Kirchengebäudes und seiner Ausstattung in der Auffassung des Mittelalters* (Freiburg i. Br., 1902); 2nd ed. (Freiburg i. Br., 1924).
- SCHLOSSER, J. v., *Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der Karolingischen Kunst* (Vienna, 1896).
- "Zwei Kapitel aus der Biographie einer Stadt. I. Die Entstehung Venedigs" (1897). Reprinted in *Präludien* (Berlin, 1927), p. 82ff.
- SCHLUNK, H. "Eine Gemme des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Berliner Museen*, LIX (1938), p. 33ff.
- SCHMEIDLER, B. "Der Dux und das Commune Venetiarum von 1141-1229. Beiträge zur Verfassungsgeschichte Venedigs, vornehmlich im 12. Jhdt.," *Historische Studien*, XXXV (Berlin, 1902).
- SCHMIDINGER, H. "Patriarch und Landesherr. Die weltliche Herrschaft der Patriarchen von Aquileja bis zum Ende der Staufer," Publikationen des Österr. Kulturinstituts in Rom, I, no. 1 (Graz-Köln, 1954).
- SCHMIT, F. *Kahrie Djami*. Album. *Izvestiya Russk. Archeol. Instituta v Konstantinopole*, XI (Munich, 1906).
- SCHNAASE, C. *Geschichte der bildenden Künste*, 2nd ed., VII (Düsseldorf, 1876).
- SCHNEIDER, A. M. *Byzanz. Vorarbeiten zur Topographie und Archäologie der Stadt* (Berlin, 1936).
- "Die Hagia Sophia in der politisch-religiösen Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," *Das Werk des Künstlers*, II, no. 1 (Stuttgart, 1941), p. 4ff.
- "Die Symbolik des Theoderichsgrabes in Ravenna," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLI (1941), p. 404ff.
- Review of E. Lucchesi-Palli, *Die Passions- und Endscenen*, etc., *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLII (1943-49), p. 276ff.
- SCHNEIDER, F. *Rom und Romgedanke im Mittelalter* (Munich, 1926).
- SCHNEIDER, R. v. "Über das Kairosrelief in Torcello und ihm verwandte Bildwerke," *Serta Harteliana* (Vienna, 1896), p. 279ff.
- SCHOENEBECK, H. U. von. *Der Mailänder Sarkophag und seine Nachfolge* (Vatican City, 1935).
- SCHRAMM, P. E. "Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio," *Studien der Bibliothek Warburg*, XVII (Leipzig, 1929).
- SCHREIBER, G. "Byzantinisches und abendländisches Hospital," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLII (1943-49), pp. 116ff., 373ff. Reprinted in: G. Schreiber, *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters. Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, I (Münster, 1948), p. 3ff.
- SCHULZ, B. *Die Kirchenbauten auf der Insel Torcello* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1927).
- SCHULZ, R. W. and S. H. BARNSELY. *The Monastery of Saint Luke of Stiris in Phocis* (London, 1901).
- SCHÜRER, O. "Romanische Doppelkapellen. Eine typengeschichtliche Untersuchung," *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft*, V (1929), p. 99ff.
- SELVATICO, P. *Gli antichi prospetti della basilica Marciana a Venezia* (Padua, 1879).
- *Storia della scultura* (Venice, 1813).
- *Sulla architettura e sulla scultura in Venezia dal medio evo sino ai nostri giorni* (Venice, 1847).
- and C. FOUCARD. *Monumenti artistici e storici delle provincie Venete descritti dalla Commissione istituita dal . . . Arciduca Ferdinando Massimiliano governatore generale* (Milan, 1859).
- SEZNEC, J. *La survivance des dieux antiques*, Studies of the Warburg Institute, XI (London, 1940).
- SIGIBERTUS. *Chronica*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores, IV, p. 450ff; VI, p. 311ff.
- SILVESTRE, H. "Commerce et vol de reliques au Moyen-Age," *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, XXX, nos. 3-4 (1952), p. 721ff.
- SIMON, M. *Hercule et le christianisme* (Strasbourg-Paris, 1955).
- SIMONSFELD, H. "Andrea Dandolo e le sue opere storiche," *Archivio veneto*, XIV (1877), p. 49ff.
- *Annales Venetici breves*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores, XIV (1883), p. 69ff.
- *Chronicon Venetum* (Altinate), Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores, XIV (1883), p. 1ff.
- "Historisch-Diplomatische Forschungen," *Sitzungsberichte der Münchner Akademie der Wissenschaften*, II (1897), p. 145ff.

- SIMONSFELD, H. "Kurze Venezianer Annalen," *Neues Archiv für ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde*, I (1876), p. 395 ff.
- "La Cronaca altinate," *Archivio veneto*, XVIII (1879), p. 235 ff.; XIX (1880), pp. 54 ff., 294 ff.; XXI (1881), p. 167 ff.; XXIV (1882), p. 111 ff.
- "Sulle scoperte del Dott. Roberto Galli nella cronaca altinate," *Archivio veneto*, XXXV (1888), p. 117 ff.
- *Venezianische Studien*, I, *Das Chronicon Altinate* (Munich, 1878).
- SIMSON, O. V. *Sacred Fortress. Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna* (Chicago, 1948).
- "Zu den Mosaiken von S. Vitale in Ravenna," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, XLVI (1953), p. 104 ff.
- SMITH, E. BALDWIN. *Early Christian Iconography* (Princeton, 1918).
- *The Dome. A Study in the History of Ideas* (Princeton, 1950).
- SOTIRIOU, G. A. "Ἀνασκαφαὶ τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ ναοῦ Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου ἐν Ἐφέσῳ," *Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον*, VII (1921-22), p. 89 ff.
- "Les églises byzantines de Chypres à trois et à cinq coupoles et leur place dans l'histoire de l'architecture byzantine," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VI (Atti del V Congresso di studi Bizantini) (1940), p. 401 ff.
- STAMMLER, W. "Alexander der Grosse," *Reallexikon der deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, I (1937), p. 332 ff.
- STEFANI, F. "La cattedra arabica (la cattedra Antiochena a S. Pietro di Castello)," *La Venezia*, no. 200 (1887).
- STEIN, H. *Le Palais de Justice et la Sainte Chapelle de Paris* (Paris, 1912).
- STERN, H. *Le Calendrier de 354. Etude sur son texte et sur ses illustrations* (Paris, 1953).
- "Poésies et représentations carolingiennes et byzantines des mois," *Revue archéologique*, sér. 6, XLV (1955), p. 141 ff.
- Storia di Venezia*, I (Venice, 1957).
- STRANSKY, A. "Costantino VII Porfirogenito, amante delle arti e collezionista," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VI (Atti del V Congresso di studi Bizantini, II) (1940), p. 416 ff.
- STREIT, L. "Venezia e la quarta crociata," *Archivio veneto*, XVI (1878), pp. 86 ff., 239 ff.
- STRINGA, G. B. *La chiesa di San Marco, cappella del Serenissimo Principe di Venetia. Descritta brevemente da D. G. Stringa* (Venice, 1610).
- STRZYGOWSKI, J. "Die Maria Orans in der byzantinischen Kunst," *Römische Quartalschrift*, VII (1893), p. 4 ff.
- "Die Monatszyklen der byzantinischen Kunst," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XI (1888), p. 44 ff.
- STÜCKELBERG, E. A. *Langobardische Plastik* (Kempten-Munich, 1909).
- STUTZ, U. *Die Eigenkirche als Element des mittelalterlich-germanischen Kirchenrechtes* (Berlin, 1895).
- SWARZENSKI, G. "Romanische Plastik und Inkrustationsstil in Florenz," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XXIX (1906), p. 518 ff.
- SWOBODA, K. M. "Berührungen der christlich-abendländischen Kunst mit der des Islams," *Alte und neue Kunst* I, no. 1 (1952), p. 7 ff.
- *Das Florentiner Baptisterium* (Berlin-Vienna, 1918).
- *Römische und Romanische Paläste*, 2nd ed. (Vienna, 1924).
- TASSINI, D. *La questione storico giuridica del patriarcato di Venezia-Aquileia* (Genoa, 1906).
- TESTI, L. *Le baptistère de Parme. Son histoire, son architecture, ses peintures* (Florence, 1916).
- *Storia della pittura veneziana*, I (Bergamo, 1909).
- THÜMLER, H. "Die Baukunst des 11. Jh. in Italien," *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, III (1939), p. 141 ff.
- TIEPOLO, G. *Trattato delle Santissime reliquie ultimamente ritrovate nel santuario della chiesa di S. Marco* (Venice, 1617).
- TIKKANEN, J. J. "Le rappresentazioni della Genesi in S. Marco a Venezia e la loro relazione con la Bibbia Cottoniana," *Archivio storico dell'arte*, I (1888), pp. 212 ff., 257 ff., 348 ff.

- TIMARCHI, B. "Il leone di San Marco," *Archivio storico dell'arte*, V (1892), p. 301ff.
- TISCHENDORF, C. von. *Evangelia apocrypha*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1876).
- TOESCA, P. *Il Trecento* (Turin, 1951).
- *Storia dell'arte italiana*, I, no. 2, *Il medioevo* (Turin, 1927).
- TOYNBEE, A. J. *A Study of History*, IX (London, 1954).
- TOYNBEE, J. M. C. and J. B. WARD PERKINS, "Peopled Scrolls: A Hellenistic Motif in Imperial Art," *Papers of the British School at Rome*, XVIII (1950), p. 1ff.
- TOZZI, R. "I mosaici del Battistero di S. Marco a Venezia e l'arte bizantina," *Bollettino d'arte*, XXVI (1932-33), p. 418ff.
- TREITINGER, O. *Die oströmische Kaiser- und Reichsidee nach ihrer Gestaltung im höfischen Zeremoniell* (Jena, 1938).
- UGHELLI, F. *Italia sacra*, 2nd. ed. N. Coleti, 10 vols. (Venice, 1717-22).
- VAN MARLE, R. *Iconographie de l'art profane au moyen âge et à la Renaissance*, 2 vols. (The Hague, 1931-32).
- VAN MILLINGEN, A. *Byzantine Churches in Constantinople. Their History and Architecture* (London, 1912).
- VARDANEGA, A. "Nella basilica di San Marco a Venezia: Aspetti ignorati di secolare equilibrio bizantino," *Arte cristiana*, XL (1953), p. 107ff.
- VASILIEV, A. A. "The Historical Significance of the Mosaic of Saint Demetrius at Sassoferrato," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (1950), p. 29ff.
- VELUDO, G. *Imagene della Madonna di S. Marco, monumento bizantino* (Venice, 1887).
- "La Pala d'oro," in A. Pasini, *Il tesoro di San Marco* (Venice, 1886), p. 141ff. *The Pala d'oro of the Basilica of St. Mark, Venice*, transl. by William Scott (Venice, 1887).
- Venezia e le sue lagune*, ed. Giov. Correr, et al., 2 vols. (Venice, 1847).
- VENNI, G. "Come Venezia salva il suo S. Marco," *L'illustrazione vaticana*, III (1932), p. 449ff.
- "Per la reintegrazione della basilica d'oro," *Osservatore romano*, LXXVI (1936), p. 239.
- VENTURI, A. "Lo scultore romanico di S. Mercuriale di Forlì," *L'arte*, II (1899), p. 246ff.
- *Storia dell'arte italiana*, I (Milan, 1901); II (1902); III (1904).
- VERLINDEN, C. *Les empereurs belges de Constantinople* (Brussels, 1945).
- VERNEILH, F. DE. See DE VERNEILH, F.
- VERZONE, P. *L'architettura religiosa dell'alto Medio Evo nell'Italia settentrionale* (Milan, 1942).
- VILLA, E. "La 'Basilica Apostolorum' sulla via Romana a Milano," *Arte del primo millennio. Atti del II° Convegno per lo Studio dell'Arte dell'Alto Medio Evo*, etc. (Turin, 1953), p. 77ff.
- VILLEHARDOUIN, GEOFFROY DE. *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. Faral, 2 vols. (Paris, 1938-39).
- VISENTINI, A. M. *Iconografia della Ducal Basilica dell'Evangelista San Marco* (Venice, 1726).
- VITALIANI, D. "Contribuito alla storia della laude sacra nel Veneto," *Atti e memorie dell'Accademia di Verona*, ser. 4, XIV (1914).
- VITZTHUM, G. and W. F. VOLBACH. *Die Malerei und Plastik des Mittelalters in Italien* (Wildpark-Potsdam, 1924).
- VOGT, J. "Der Erbauer der Apostelkirche in Konstantinopel," *Hermes*, LXXXI (1953), p. 111ff.
- VOLBACH, W. F. "Gli avori della 'Cattedra di S. Marco,'" *Arte del primo millennio. Atti del II° Convegno per lo Studio dell'Arte dell'Alto Medio Evo* (Pavia, 1950), p. 314ff.
- See also WULFF, O.
- VOLPE, G. *Movimenti religiosi e sette ereticali nella società medioevale italiana* (Florence, 1926).
- VON BLANKENBURG, W. *Heilige und Dämonische Tiere* (Leipzig, 1943).
- VON DER GABELENTZ, H. *Die kirchliche Kunst im italienischen Mittelalter. Ihre Beziehungen zu Kultur und Glaubenslehre* (Strasbourg, 1907).
- *Mittelalterliche Plastik in Venedig* (Leipzig, 1903).
- VORAGINE, JACOBUS DE. See DE VORAGINE, J.

- WACHTSMUTH, F. *Der Raum*, 2 vols. (Marburg, 1929, 1935).
- WACKERNAGEL, W. "Die Plastik des XI und XII Jahrhunderts in Apulien," *Kunsthist. Forschungen*, herg. v. Kgl. Preuss. Histor. Institut in Rom (Rome, 1911).
- WARD PERKINS, J. B. "The Bronze Lion of St. Mark's at Venice," *Antiquity*, XXI (1947), p. 23ff.
- WEBSTER, J. C. *The Labours of the Months in Antique and Mediaeval Art to the End of the Twelfth Century*, Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology, IV (Princeton, 1938).
- WEIGAND, E. "Zur Datierung der Ciboriumssäulen von S. Marco in Venedig," *Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, VI (Atti del V Congresso Internaz. di Studi Bizantini, II) (1940), p. 440ff.
- WEITZMANN, K. "Constantinopolitan Book Illumination in the Period of the Latin Conquest," *Gazette des beaux-arts*, XXV (1944), p. 193ff.
- "Das Evangelion im Skevophylakion zu Lawra," *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, VIII (1936), p. 88ff.
- *Greek Mythology in Byzantine Art* (Princeton, 1951).
- WENTZEL, H. "Antiken-Imitationen des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts in Italien," *Zeitschr. für Kunstwissenschaft*, IX (1955), p. 29ff.
- "Der Augustalis Friedrich II und die abendländische Glyptik des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, XV (1952), p. 183ff.
- "Die grosse Kamee mit Poseidon und Athena in Paris," *Wallraf-Richartz Jahrbuch*, XVI (1954), p. 53ff.
- "Die Münchener Christuskamee," *Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und christlichen Archäologie*, II (Baden-Baden, 1953), p. 341ff.
- "Eine Kamee aus Lothringen in Florenz und andere Kunstkammer-Gemmen," *Jahrbuch der Preuss. Kunstsammlungen*, XLIV (1943), p. 11.
- "Mittelalterliche Gemmen," *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft*, VIII (1941), p. 49ff.
- "Mittelalter und Antike im Spiegel kleiner Kunstwerke des 13. Jahrhunderts," *Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Henrik Cornell* (Stockholm, 1950), p. 67ff.
- WHITEMORE, T. *The Mosaics of Hagia Sophia at Istanbul*, I-IV (Oxford, 1933-52).
- WILLEMSEN, C. A. *Kaiser Friedrich II Triumphator zu Capua* (Wiesbaden, 1953).
- WILPERT, J. *I sarcofagi Cristiani antichi* (Rome, 1929).
- WISEMAN, N. *Brano d'un discorso e memorie sull'antico e moderno tesoro della basilica di S. Marco in Venezia* (Venice, 1850).
- WOLFF, R. L. "Footnote to an Incident of the Latin Occupation of Constantinople. The Church and the Icon of the Hodegetria," *Traditio*, VI (1948), p. 319ff.
- "Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204-1261," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8 (1954), p. 225ff.
- WÜLCKER, R. P. *Das Evangelium Nicodemi in der abendländischen Literatur* (Paderborn, 1872).
- WULFF, O. *Altchristliche und Byzantinische Kunst*, 2 vols. (Berlin-Neubabelsberg, n. d.).
- *Altchristliche und Mittelalterliche, Byzantinische und Italienische Bildwerke* (Berliner Museen). II, *Mittelalterliche Bildwerke* (Berlin, 1911); 2nd ed. by W. F. Volbach (Berlin, 1930).
- "Die sieben Wunder von Byzanz und die Apostelkirche nach Konstantinos Rhodios," *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VII (1898), pp. 310-331.
- "Ein Gang durch die Geschichte der altchristlichen Kunst mit ihren neuen Pfadfindern," *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, XXXV (1912), p. 193ff.
- WULZINGER, K. "Die Apostelkirche und die Mehmedije zu Konstantinopel," *Byzantion*, VII (1932), p. 7ff.
- XANTHOUDIDES, S. *Ἡ Ἐνετοκρατία ἐν Κρήτῃ καὶ οἱ κατὰ τῶν Ἐνετῶν ἀγῶνες τῶν κρητῶν* (Athens, 1939).
- XYNGOPOULOS, A. "Βυζαντινὸν ἀνάγλυφον τοῦ Ἡρακλέους," *Ἀρχαιολ. Ἐφημερίς* (1927-28), p. 1ff.
- "Φραγκοβυζαντινὰ γλυπτὰ ἐν Ἀθήναις," *Ἀρχαιολ. Ἐφημερίς* (1931), p. 69ff.

- YRIARTE, C. "Les restaurations de Saint-Marc de Venise," *Revue des deux mondes*, XXXVIII (1880), p. 827ff.
- ZACCARINI, M. G. "Le colonne del ciborio di San Marco in Venezia," *Rivista della città di Venezia*, XII (1933), p. 123ff.
- ZALOZIECKY, W. *Die Sophienkirche in Konstantinopel und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der abendländischen Architektur*. Studi di Antichità Cristiana, XII (Vatican City, 1936).
- ZANELLA, G. *I cavalli di S. Marco* (Padua, 1877).
- ZANETTI, G. A. *Della beretta ducale volgarmente chiamata corno, che portasi dai Dogi di Venezia, dissertazione* (Venice, 1779).
- ZANOTTO, F. *Novissima guida di Venezia* (Venice, 1856).
- *Venezia e le sue lagune*, 2 vols. (Venice, 1847).
- ZIMMERMANN, M. G. *Oberitalische Plastik im frühen und hohen Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1897).
- ZORZI, A. P. *Osservazioni intorno ai restauri della basilica di S. Marco*, etc. (Venice, 1877).
- ZORZI, A. and G. MAZZATINTI. *Inventari dei manoscritti dell'archivio e della biblioteca già capitolari ed antico archivio comunale di Cividale del Friuli* (Cividale, 1899).
- ZORZI, E. "I restauri nella basilica di San Marco," *Emporium*, LXXXV (1937), p. 247ff.
- ZOVATTO, P. L. "Antichi monumenti di Julia Concordia Sagittaria," *Monumenti di antichità cristiana*, ser. 2, VII (Vatican City, 1950).
- "Il battistero di Concordia," *Arte veneta*, I (1947), pp. 171ff., 243ff.
- "La cattedra reliquiario di San Marco a Venezia," *Aquileia nostra*, XXVI (1955), p. 41ff.

INDEX

The following index is intended to supplement the Table of Contents, and does not, therefore, list items that can easily be found with the help of the latter; nor does it list names of authors, including primary authorities (see Bibliography). All entries referring to San Marco are given under that heading, not under "Venice, churches."

- Abbazia San Salvatore, church, 98f.
 acanthus, 143, 146, 164
 Acre, 29, 113; church of St. Mark, 44
 Agatha, St., 17
 Aix-la-Chapelle, 48, 66
 Alexander the Great, 59, 111f.
 Alexander III, pope, 25, 44, 47
 Alexandria, 8ff., 16, 31, 59, 105
 Alexius I Comnenus, emperor, 23f.
 Alexius III Angelus, emperor, 25
 Alhambra, reliefs, 148
 allegories, 150ff.; see also: *Artes Liberales*,
 Beatitudes, Luxuria, Months, Oceanus, Terra,
 Vices, Virtues.
 Altinum, town and bishopric, 4, 19
 Ambrose, St., 5ff., 10, 31, 68
 Amiana, church of St. Mark, 12
 Amiens, cathedral, 157
 Anastasius, St., 17
 Ancona, 25
 Andrew, St., 5ff., 31
 Andronicus I, emperor, 25f.
 Andronicus III, emperor, 30
 Angoulême, churches, 96
 Anianus, St., 16
 Annunciation, 133; to the shepherds, 169
 Antelami, Benedetto, 84, 118ff., 152ff., 158ff.,
 163ff., 185ff.
 Anthemius, 98
 apocrypha, 58
 Apollinaris, St., 31
 Apulia, 58
 Aquileia, Church of, 10ff., 30ff.; churches: S. An-
 drew (= Apostles' church) 6, S. Antonio di
 Padova, 6; Museum, relief of Fortuna, 182;
 patriarchate, 10ff., 30ff., 59; sacrophagi, 177
 Aquileian schism, 32ff.
 arches, pointed, 77ff., 81
 Arezzo, cathedral, 97, 154
 Arles, St. Trophime, 31
Artes Liberales, allegories of, 161ff.
 arti, see guilds
 Ataulf, king, 30
 Athens, Byzantine Museum, 174; Palaia Metro-
 polis, 111
 Aurius, tribune, 12
 Bacchus, St., 4, 5, 17, 21
 Baduarius, Justinus, procurator, 53
 Baldwin II, emperor, 18, 27
 Bâle, museum, 175
 Bamberg, cathedral, 136, 163
 Barattieri, Nicolò dei, 85, 117f.
 Barbara, St., 17
 Bari, S. Gregorio, 104; S. Nicola, 134, 142f., 148,
 150, 152
 Barnabas, St., 31
 Bartholomew, St., 8
 Basil I, emperor, 23
 Basilius, Otho, procurator, 52f.
 Bassianus, bishop, 6
 Beatitudes, allegories of, 157ff.
 Bede, 10
 Bellini, Gentile, 164, 194
 Bellini, Giovanni, 194
 Benedict I, pope, 38
 Benedict IX, pope, 36
 Berchet, F., 196f.
 Berlin, Staatl. Museen, reliefs, 148
 Bernard, St., 150
 Berthold, patriarch, 40
 Bertucius, goldsmith, 139, 181
 Berytus, church of St. Mark, 44
 Bianchini, Vincenzo, mosaicist, 86
 Blasius, St., 17
 Borgo San Donnino, cathedral, 134f., 149, 154,
 157
 Brazen serpent, 176
 Brescia, apostles' church, 6
 Brevnov, relief, 139
 Buon, Bartolomeo, Proto di San Marco, 194
 Cadorin, L., 197
 Cairo, wood carvings, 148
 cameo cutting, 174
 Cana, miracle at, 167, 169
 Cancianilla, St., 5, 30
 Cancianus, St., 5, 30
 Cancius, St., 5, 30
 Candia, church of St. Mark, 44
 Candiani, 51
 Candiano, Petrus IV, doge, 12, 66, 69, 74,
 194
 Candiano, Vitale, doge, 12, 35
 Candidianus, patriarch, 33f.
 Caorle, bishopric, 4, 5; cathedral, 121
 Caresini, Rafaino, 79
 Castello, see Olivolo-Castello-Rialto

- cathedra, of Grado, 11; of Orseoli, 11; of St. Her-
 magoras, 10f.; of St. Mark, 11f., 16, 33; of
 St. Peter, 11
 Cefalù, cathedral, 48f.
 Chalcedon, 91
 Charlemagne, 20, 48, 55f.
 Chartres, cathedral, 152, 161
 Chios, 17, 28; Nea Moni, 98
 Christ, Chalkites, 122; Emanuel, 142, 155, 172f.;
 in majesty, 168; Pantocrator, 48, 142, 163, 172f.,
 standing, 169
 Chromatius, bishop, 6
 Chrysogonus, St., 30
 Cividale, Biblioteca Capitolare, Psalter of St.
 Elizabeth, 137
 Claudia, St., 8
 Clement, St., 17
 Clement (III), antipope, 43
 Commodus, emperor, 134
 Como, SS. Apostoli, 68
 Concordia, apostles' church, 5, 8; baptistery and
 triconchos, 99; bishopric, 4; sarcophagi, 177
 Conrad II, emperor, 23, 36
 Constantine the Great, emperor, 46, 57, 91f.;
 Porphyrogenitus, 91f.; of Rhodes, 91ff.
 Constantinople, booty from, 17f., 26f., 47, 113ff.,
 120ff., 129, 134; captured by Latins in 1204,
 26, 53, 120f., 180; churches: St. Akyndinos, 41,
 Holy Apostles' 5ff., 12, 23, 28, 45f., 49, 55f., 67,
 69, 90ff., 180, St. Barbara, 28, Christ Pante-
 poptes, 28, Christ Pantocrator, 24, 27f., 47, 84,
 98, Constantine Lips, 142, St. Irene, 70, Kariye
 Camii (Christ of Chora), sculpture, 111, 142, 145,
 Kilisse Camii, 98, St. Mark, 28, 67, St. Mary
 Chalkoprateia, 28, St. Mary Peribleptos, 28,
 St. Mary of the Pharos, 132f., Myrelaion, 98,
 St. Nicholas, 22, St. Sophia, 24, 26, 28, 47, 49,
 56, 67, St. Theodore, 21; Chrysotriklinos, 55f.;
 Fatih Camii, 91; imperial palace, 48; recovered
 by Greeks in 1261, 29, 146, 187.
 Constantius, emperor, 91
 Contarini, Domenico, doge, 12, 23, 47, 70ff., 90,
 193
 Cormons, 33
 Cornelius, St., 17
 corno (ducal beret), 51f.
 coronation rites, 50
 correttori, 51
 Corvo, Giovanni, Proto di San Marco, 193
 Cosmati, 141, 183
 Cremona, 110, 154
 Crusade, 28f., 113, 120f., 134
 Cyprianus, St., 17
 Cyrillus, St. 17

 Dalmatia, 36ff.; bishoprics, 39f.
 Dandolo, Andrea, doge, 17, 24, 46, 79
 Dandolo, Enrico, doge, 26, 28, 47
 Dandolo, Enrico, patriarch, 37, 39ff.
 Dandolo, Petrus, procurator, 54
 Dauro, Jacopo, 22
 Dečani, church, 143, 145
 Deesis, 155
 Demetrius, St., 128ff.
 Deusdedit, doge, 20

 Diedo, Antonio, 196
 Diocletian, emperor, 122, 134
 Dionysius, St. 30f.
 doges, coronation, 47ff.; costume, 51f.; graves,
 45ff.; portraits, 23ff.; throne, 47ff.; titles 23ff.
 Dominicus, patriarch, 36
 Donatus, master, 178, 185f.
 Donatus, patriarch, 33
 Dorothea, St. 5, 16
 Dura-Europos, 182
 Durazzo, church of St. Mark, 44
 Dyrrhachium, see Durazzo

 Eger, Palatine chapel, 86
 Egypt, 29, 105
 Elias of Grado, see Helias
 Elijah, ascension of, 176
 Ephesus, St. John, 67f., 92ff.
 Epirus, despotate, 188
 equestrian saints, 134
 Equilus, see Jesolo
 Eraclea, see Heraciana
 Erasma, St., 5, 16
 Erasmus of Rotterdam, 134
 Euphemia, St., 5, 16
 Euprepis, St., 31
 Eutychius, St., 17

 Faletro, Angelus, procurator, see Falier
 Falier, Angelo, procurator, 24, 52f.
 Falier, Ordelaaffo, doge, 23f., 46, 87
 Falier, Vitale, doge, 12, 23, 46, 70ff., 90, 197
 Felix, St., 30
 Fermez, stuccoes, 148
 Ferrara, 110, 120, 143, 154
 Ferrari, Giovanni Battista, 197
 Flight to Egypt, 15, 174
 Florence, Bargello, Carrand ivories, 154f.
 Fondi, apostles' church, 7
 Forlati, Ferdinando, Proto di San Marco, 45, 65
 73, 193ff.
 Fortunatus, patriarch, 67
 Fortunatus, St., 5, 16f., 30f.
 Foscari, Francesco, doge, 194
 Fradello, Leonardo, procurator, 44
 Francis, St., 14
 Franco, 197
 Franks, 33
 Frederick Barbarossa, emperor, 25, 47
 Frederick II, emperor, 40, 56ff., 176, 180
 Freiburg, castle, 86
 Fritsch, P., 199f.
 Fustinelli, Cesare, Proto di San Marco, 196

 Gabriel, archangel, 132
 Gaibana, Giovanni da, 136
 Gallienus, emperor, 134
 Gaudentius, bishop, 6
 Gemonia, cathedral, 186
 Genoa, 29f., 54, 113
 George, St., 17, 22, 128ff.
 Gerasa, apostles' church, 68
 Gisulf, duke, 33
 Giustiniani, Orsato, 54
 glass, manufacture and import of, 29

- Goslar, St. Ulrich, 86
 Gradenigo, Bartolomeo, doge, 46, 82, 140
 Gradenigo, Piero, doge, 27
 Grado, Church of, 30ff.; churches: S. Agata, 67, cathedral, 10, St. Mark, 12; patriarchate, 30ff., 59; relics, 30f.; sarcophagi, 177
 Gregori, Marco, Proto di San Marco, 196
 Gregory of Nazianzus, St., 17, 46
 Gregory II, pope, 33
 guilds, 162

 Helena, St., 17
 Helias of Grado, patriarch, 4, 32ff., 85
 Henry IV, emperor, 13
 Henry VI, emperor, 44, 49
 Heracles, 58, 125ff., 132ff.
 Heracles Master, 125ff., 138ff., 142ff., 147f., 164f., 180f.
 Heradiana-Cittanova, bishopric, 4, 5, 19, 68, 127, 135
 Heraclius, emperor, 10, 16, 33
 Hercules, see Heracles
 Hermagoras, St., 5, 11, 16f., 30ff.
 Hermogenes, St., 30
 Hermolaus, St., 17
 Hetoimasia, 173
 Hilary, St., 5, 30
 Hippolytus, St., 17

 Innocent III, pope, 28
 inquisition, 52
inquisitores, 50f.
 Irene, empress, 24
 Irene (Palaeologina), empress, 188
 Isaac, sacrifice of, 111, 174
 Isaac II Angelus, emperor, 25
 Isidore, St., 17, 28
 Isidore the younger, architect, 98
 Istanbul, museum: relief of *Traditio legis*, 172; relief of Orant Virgin, 124f., 131
 Istria, 19, 33, 36ff.
 ivories, Italo-Byzantine, 125, 174

 James, St., 8, 31
 Jean de Tournay, 121, 187
 Jerome, St., 10
 Jerusalem, church of Holy Sepulchre, 44, 64f., 94; house of Pilate, 27; Kingdom of, 28
 Jesolo, bishopric, 4, 68; cathedral, 99
 Jesse, Tree of, 86
 Joachim of Floris (Flora), 40, 59
 Johannes, doge, 41
 John, evangelist, relics, 5ff.
 John II Comnenus, emperor, 24f.
 John VI Cantacuzenus, emperor, 30
 John VIII, pope, 41
 John of Alexandria, St., 17
 John of Aquileia, patriarch, 35
 John Baptist, St., 5ff., 17
 John Chrysostom, St., 46
 John of Grado, patriarch, 33
 John of Ravenna, patricius, 32
 Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople, 27
 Joseph's Dream, 15, 184
 Judah, 40

 Judas Thaddaeus, St. 8
 Justinian, emperor, 7, 57, 91ff., 179

 Kiev, 114, 142
 Klosterneuburg, ambo, 158

 Landsberg, castle, 86
 Largus, St., 30
 Last Supper, 167
 Latin Empire, 26ff., 180
 Lazarus, Raising of, 167
 Lazzari, 196
 leaved cross, 171
 Leningrad, Hermitage: cameos, 176, relief of St. Demetrius, 129
 Leo III, emperor, 20
 Leo V, emperor, 63
 Leo IX, pope, 36, 72
 Leopardi, Alessandro, 79
 Levites, 169
 Lodi, apostles' church, 6
 Lombardi, family of artists, 79
 London, British Museum, cameo, 176
 Longhena, Baldassare, Proto di San Marco, 195f.
 Longobards, 32ff., 44
 Lorch, 47
 Louis, king, 18
 Lucca, church façades, 101; S. Michele, 151
 Lucia, St., 17
 Luke, St., relics, 5ff.
 Luxuria, allegory of, 150f.
 Lysippus, 127ff.

 Magi, adoration of, 169, 184
 Mainz, St. Godehard, 86
 Malamocco, town and bishopric, 4, 19f.
 Manfredi, M., Proto di San Marco, 198
 Mantua, cathedral, sarcophagus, 172; Council of, 34ff.
 Manuel I Comnenus, emperor, 25f.
 Marangoni, Luigi, Proto di San Marco, 198
 Marina, St., 17
 Mark, St., *apparitio* of relics, 12ff., 18; cathedra of, see cathedra of St. Mark; founder of Aquileian Church, 30ff.; *collocatio* of relics, 12ff., 71; gospels of, 16; *inventio* of relics, 12f., 71; lion as symbol, 52, 54; *praedestinatio*, 14f., 41; ring of, 15f.; *translatio* of relics, 8ff., 20f., 34, 41, 64, 103; *vaticinatio*, 14f., 19
 Martin, St., 5
 Marturio, patriarch, 41
Martyrium Hieronymianum, 6
 Mauritius, doge, 4, 20, 41
 Maurus, tribune, 12
 Maxentius, patriarch, 34
 Maximianus, bishop, 7
 Mazula, architect, 89f., 100
 Meduna, Giovanni Battista, Proto di San Marco, 196
 Mehmed II, sultan, 91
 Menas, St., 5
 Menio, Tribuno, doge, 12
mensa martyrum, 171
 Merrakesh reliefs, 148
 Mesarites, Nicholas, 91, 93f.

- Mestieri Master 161 ff.
 Methamaucum, see Malamocco
 Michael, archangel, 132 f.
 Michael II of Epirus, 188
 Michael III, emperor, 11
 Michael VII Ducas, emperor, 23
 Michael VIII Palaeologus, emperor, 29
 Michael IX, co-emperor, 188
 Michiel, Domenico, doge, 28, 121
 Michiel, Felicitas, dogaressa, 46, 197
 Michiel, Marco, Bishop of Castello, 52
 Michiel, Vitale I, doge, 23, 46
 Milan, Church of, 5 ff., 31 f.; St. Ambrogio, sarcophagus of, 172; apostles' church, 5, 6, 31, 68; S. Nazarius, 5 f., 31
 Milesevo, church, 146
 Minio, 196
 Mistra, 142
 Mocenigo, Giovanni, doge, 194
 Modena, cathedral, 84, 110, 134, 143, 151
 Molino, Leo da, 53, 75
 Molmenti, Pompeo, 197
 Monreale, cathedral, 48 f., 134
 Months, allegories of, 149, 153, 163
 Moon, personification of, 155
 Morosini, Domenico, doge, 43, 51
 Morosini, Marino, doge, 46, 52, 77, 170
 Morosini, Tommaso, patriarch, 28
 Moscow, Tretyakov Gallery, 129
 Munich, cameo, 176
 Murano, S. Donato, 66, 99 f.; relief of S. Donatus, 187
 Myra, 17

 Narses, 21, 44
 Nativity of Christ, 144, 169, 174
 Nazarius, St., 30
 Nerez, church, iconostasis, 145
 Nero, emperor, 134
 Nicetas, patricius, 20 f.
 Nicetas, St., 17
 Nicholas, St., 5, 17
 Nicholas Mesarites, see Mesarites
 Nicholas of Clairvaux, 96
 Nicholas of Verdun, 158
 Nicodemus, St., presbyter, 17
 Noah, 176
 Nola, apostles' church, 7
 Nonantola, S. Silvestro, 143
 Nürnberg, Palatine Chapel, 86

 Obeliebatus, bishop of Castello, 4
 Obelierius, doge, 20
 Oceanus, allegory of, 150 f.
 Ochrid, St. Sophia, 77
 Oderzo, see Opitergium
 Olivolo-Castello-Rialto, bishopric, 4 ff., 10, 20 f., 41 f., 44, 52
 Olivolo, cathedral, S. Pietro, 69
 Olympia, Temple of Zeus, 127 f.
 Opitergium, town and bishopric, 4, 19
 Orseoli, 11 f., 51
 Orseolo, Petrus I, 11 f., 69 ff., 90
 Orseolo, Petrus II, 12, 23, 39, 69 f.
 Ostiglia, sarcophagus, 178

 Otto I, emperor, 35, 56
 Otto II, emperor, 35, 56
 Otto III, emperor, 11, 56

 Padua, 19, 31; churches: Eremitani, 154, S. Prosdocimo, 68, Santo: 100, sarcophagi, 173 f., 177 f., 181; St. Sophia, 99
 Palaeologan art, 146 f., 182, 188 ff.
 Palatine chapels, 86
 Palermo, Cappella Palatina, 48 f., 148, 158; church of St. Mark, 44; Favara Palace, 48
 Pantaleon, St., 17, 22
 Pantocrator, see Christ
 Paris, Louvre, cameos, 176; Notre Dame, 157, 163; Ste-Chapelle, 18
 Parma, baptistery, 119 f., 154, 158, 160, 185; cathedral, 99, 110, 120, 134, 157
 Paros, Katapoliani, 95
 Partecipatii, ducal family, 46, 67
 Partecipacius, Agnellus, doge, 21
 Partecipacius, Johannes, doge, 12, 45, 64
 Partecipacius, Justinian, doge, 9, 11, 20, 44, 63 ff.
 Partecipacius, Ursus, doge, 23
 Passion of Christ, 167
 Paul, St., 7, 169
 Paul Hermit, St., 17, 28
 Paul Martyr, St., 17, 28
 Paul of Constantinople, St., 17
 Paul II, pope, 79
 Paulinus, bishop, 32 f.
 Paulus Diaconus, 10
 Pavia, 110; S. Michele, 151
 Pelagius I, pope, 32 ff., 85
 Périgueux, Saint-Front, 31, 83, 95 f., 173
 Peter, St., 5, 7, 10, 21, 31, 34, 169
 Peter of Antioch, patriarch, 36
 Petrus Damiani, St., 96
 Phares, son of Judah, 40
 Philes, Manuel, 129, 133, 135
 Philip, son of Baldwin II, 27 f.
 Philip, St. 8
 Photius, 132
 Piacenza, cathedral, 99, 110, 157, 161
 Pisa, cathedral, 71 f., 97; cathedral museum, Madonna, 184; church façades, 101
 Pisano, Giovanni, 184
 Pisano, Nicolo, 165, 183 f.
 pointed arches, see arches, pointed
 Poitou, 157
 Polani, Pietro, doge, 42, 44
 Pomposa, abbazia, 100, 102, 115, 143
 Poppo, patriarch, 35 f.
 Portogruaro, cathedral, relief of Virgin, 189; museum, relief of Virgin, 189
 Postumus, emperor, 134
 Primigenius of Grado, bishop, 16, 33
 Primogenius, see Primigenius
 Procopius of Caesarea, 91
 Procuratori, Procurazia, 52 ff., 193
promissio, 50 ff.
 prophets, 141 ff., 145, 163 f., 185 f.
 Prosdocimus, St., 31
 Proto di San Maro, 97, 193 ff.
 protorenaissance, 58 ff., 101 ff., 165 ff.
 Protus, St., 30

Psalter of St. Elizabeth, see Cividale
Psychomachia, 157

Querini, Vincenzo, 18

Radovan, Master, 119f., 156

Raduanus, see Radovan

Ravenna, 65, 178ff.; Church of, 6ff., 31f.; churches: St. Andrew, 7, S. Apollinare, 31, S. Francesco, 68, S. Giovanni Evangelista, 7, Sta Maria in Porto, relief, 121, 131, SS. Pietro e Paolo, 7, S. Stefano, 7, San Vitale, 97; exarchate, 19, 69; museum, 127; sarcophagi, 178; Theodoric: Palace of, 66, sepulchre of, 46

Reichenau, monastery, 14

renovatio, 55ff., 179ff.

Resurrection of Christ, 167

Rheda, castle, 86

Rheims, cathedral, 163; Master of Visitation, 183

Rialto, bishopric, see Olivolo-Castello-Rialto; island, 4, 14, 21

Ricovrati, Bartolomeo, primicerius, 77

Ricta, empress, 188

Romanus, St., 17

Rome, SS. Apostoli, 68; S. Paolo Fuori le Mura, Paschal candelabrum, 183

Rouen, apostles' church, 7

Rufiniana, apostles' church, 91

Rufinus, 10, 91

ruler-liturgy, 51

Ruskin, John, 197

Rusticus, 8, 11

Saccardo, Pietro, Proto di San Marco, 196

Saint-Denis, 31, 47, 154

Saintonge, 157

Salonica, Panagia Chalkeon, 98

Samson, 134, 150f.

San Marco, altars: 27, 43, 66f., 98, 112, 139, of St. John, 140, of St. Leonard, 17, 139; architects, 90; atrium: 76ff., pavement, 80, pozzo, 81, 85, vaults, 81f.; balustrades, 84f.; Baptistery, 76ff.; building technique, 82f., 89f., 99; campanile, 66, 105; capitals, 81, 177; Cappelle: San Clemente, 43, 47ff., 51, 53, 85, Sant' Isidoro, 17, 22, 28, 63ff., 66, 73, 76, 197, della Madonna dei Mascoli, 66, 76, San Pietro, 43, 85, delle Reliquie, 66, 172f., Zeno, 70, 76ff., 79f., 100, 113, 145, 185ff., 195f.; consecration, 12f.; corbel table, 84f.; crypt, 43, 66f., 74, 98; doors, bronze, 53, 75, 139, 181; façades, 76ff., 81, 100ff., 111ff., 125ff., 179, 196ff.; fenestration 86f.; festivals, 55; fires, 87, 144, 194; galleries, 49ff., 83f.; horses, bronze, 27, 113; iconostasis, 117, 137ff., 145.

MOSAICS: allegories of Virtues, 158ff., 183; Apparition of St. Mark's relics, 14; Ascension, 158; of atrium, 141, 179, 201; Building of the Ark, 162f., 183; of façade, 103f.; Last Judgement, 114, 149f.; preservation, 201ff.; technique, 201; above Tesoro door, 18; of Zeno chapel, 14. Pala d'oro, 23ff., 27, 52, 75, 139; pavement, restoration, 197ff.; Pietra del Bando, 29, 54, 113; Pillars from Acre, 29, 54, 113; Porta Sant'

Alipio, 103ff., 113f., 126, 140f.; Porta dei Fiori, 77, 101, 104f., 144f.; Porta San Giovanni, 104; Porta della Madonna, 77; relics, 16ff., 27; rites, 54f.; Saracenic details, 104f., 117.

SCULPTURE: angels: of Cappella Zeno, 174, of central square, 84f., 119f., 156f., of Lapidarium, 188, of south façade, 174; Annunciation, west façade, 143f.; architectural, 81f., 115ff.; Baptism, Baptistery, 190; central porch, arches, 148ff.; Christ: relief of seated, 137f., with two angels, Cappella delle Reliquie, 172f.; ciborium columns, 166ff., 183; SS. Cosmas and Damian, 123; evangelists: Ciborium, 168, 183f., north façade, 137ff.; Gabriel, Archangel, 131f.; Heracles: with boar, 126ff., with stag, 127ff.; Hetoimasia with lambs, 173; Hodegetria, standing, 189; Madonna dello Schioppo, 186, 188f.; Nativity, Cappella Zeno, 174; orientaling reliefs, 122, 147f.; Porta Sant' Alipio: lintel, 168ff., reliefs, 140ff.; Porta dei Fiori, reliefs, 144f., 168; Porta San Giovanni, *sopraporta*, 147; prophets, Cappella Zeno, 185f.; protomes, 84f., 118; Sacrifice of Isaac, 174; St. Christopher, 186; St. Demetrius, 128ff.; St. George: Baptistery, 190, north façade, 138f., west façade, 111, 130f., on horseback, 143; St. John Evangelist, standing, 140; St. Leonard, 139f.; St. Peter, Cappella San Pietro, 173; St. Theodore, Baptistery, 190; sarcophagus of Marino Morosini, 170f.; *Sogno di San Marco*, 15, 184; south entrance, reliefs, 145; symbols of evangelists, 143; Tesoro, *sopraporta*, 144; *Traditio legis*, 171f.; "Trimorphon" (Deesis), 122; "Victory," north façade, 181f.; Virgin: Aniketos, 187f., Cappella della Madonna, 189, Orant, 123ff., 131ff., 180. Tesoro, 171f., 63, 66, 73, 76, 78, 144, 194, 196; terracotta decor, 99f.; throne: of doge, 47ff., of patriarch, 43

Sansovino, Francesco, 195

Sansovino, Jacopo, Proto di San Marco, 195

Sapientes, 51

Sardi, Giuseppe, Proto di San Marco, 196

Sassanian palmette, 141ff.

Saturninus, St., 17

scrolls, 141ff., 150ff., 164f.

Selvo, Domenico, doge, 12, 23, 25, 27, 46f., 70ff.

Serenus, patriarch, 33

Sergius, St., 4, 5, 17, 21

Sergius IV, pope, 35

Severus, patriarch, 33

Seville, stone reliefs, 148

Sicily, 68, 72

Sidon, stone from, 121

Siena, 185

Simeon, St., 17

Simon, St., 8

Smaragdus, exarch, 33

Sogno di San Marco, 15, 184

Sopoćani, church, 146

Soranzo, Giovanni, doge, 46, 79, 82

Spavento, Giorgio, Proto di San Marco, 194

Speculum Mundi, 150, 152

"Sposalizio del mar," 15

Stauracius, monk, 8

- Steingaden, 47
 Stephen, St., 17
 Strasbourg, cathedral, 163
 Stroganoff collection, reliefs, 145, 149
 Studenica, church, 145
 Sun, personification of, 155
 Sylvester II, pope, 35
 Syria, 105
- Tatianus, St., 30
 Terra, allegory of, 150f.
 Thamar, 40
 Thecla, St., 5, 16
 Theodora Ducas, princess, wife of Doge Selvo, 23, 25
 Theodora Petraliphas, 188
 Theodore, monk, 8
 Theodore of Amasea, St., 22
 Theodore Belonas, 91
 Theodore of Mesembria, St., 17
 Theodore Stratelates, St., 5, 17, 21 ff., 43, 63, 134, representations of, 22
 Theodoric, king, 46
 Theodosius I, emperor, 67, 91
 Theodulf of Orleans, 134
 Theophilus of Antioch, 36
 Theophylactus, patriarch, 91
 Thomas, St., relics, 5 ff.
 Three Chapters, controversy of, 33
 Tiberius, deacon, 34
 Tiepolo, Jacopo, doge, 50 ff., 113
 Tiepolo, Lorenzo, doge, 162
 Timothy, St., 6
 Tintoretto, Jacopo, 198f.
 Tirali, Andrea, Proto di San Marco, 196
 Titles, Byzantine, 20, 23
 Torcello, bishopric, 4, 19; cathedral, 64, 69, 116 ff.; Sta Fosca, 66
 trades, representations of, 85, 117 f., 161 ff.
Traditio legis, 171 f.
 Trajan, emperor, 134
 Trandonicus, Petrus, doge, 23
 Trani, 134
 Traù, see Trogir
 Treviso, cathedral, enthroned Christ, 172; S. Nicolo, 178, 185
 Tribuno, Pietro, doge, 65
 Tribunus, 8, 11
 Tribunus Menius, doge, 12, 44
 Tripoli, 28
 Trogir, cathedral, 119 f., 154, 156 f., 165
 Troia, 150f.
 Troy, 58 f.
 Tunisia, 29
 Tyre, 28 f.; church of St. Mark, 44
- Udalric, patriarch, 36 f.
 Ursus, Bishop of Castello, 4, 9
 Ursus, doge, 20, 41
- Valentine, St., 14
 Valerianus, bishop, 6
 Valerianus, St., 30
 Van Nice, R. L., 66
 Vatopedi, 142
 Venantius Fortunatus, 10
 Venerius, patriarch, 34
- Venice, Campiello Angaran, relief, 123; Church of, 34 ff., 41 ff., 56.
CHURCHES: Abbazia della Misericordia, 121, SS. Apostoli, 5, 8, Sta Barbara, 17, S. Basso, 44; S. Daniele, 17, SS. Filippo e Jacopo, 184, S. Francesco del Deserto, 14, SS. Geminiano e Mena, 5, 44, 101, S. Giacomo di Rialto, 5, 8, 69, 99, S. Giorgio dei Greci, 37, S. Giorgio Maggiore, 17, 44, 47, 134, S. Giovanni in Bragora, 5, S. Giovanni Elemosinario, relief of Nativity, 174, SS. Giovanni e Paolo: 47, 121, 178, Tiepolo sarcophagus, 177, Zeno sarcophagus, 173; S. Giuliano, 5, 44, Sta Giustina, 5, S. Ilario, 23, 46 f., 64, 67, S. Lorenzo, 17, 23, 67, 140, San Marco, see San Marco, Sta Maria del Carmine, 17, Sta Maria Formosa, 5, 17, Sta Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, 47, 173, Sta Maria Mater Domini, 121, 125, Sta Marina, 17, S. Martino, 5, St. Nicholas in the Doges Palace, 26, S. Nicola dei Mendicoli, 5, S. Nicolo di Lido, 13, 17, 47, 90, S. Pietro di Castello: 4, 10, baptistery, 99; S. Raffaele, 5, 17, S. Saba, 44, S. Salvatore, 5, 17, 22, 44, 64 f., 100, SS. Sergius and Bacchus, church, 4, 5, S. Severo, 23, 67, S. Silvestro, 41, S. Simeone Grande, 17, S. Teodoro, 4, 11, 21 f., 44, 63, 73 ff., 97, 179, S. Teodoro di Amasea, 22, S. Trinità, 17, S. Trovaso, 121, S. Ubaldo, 17, S. Zaccaria, 5, 17, 23, 47, 63 f., 67.
 coinage, 26; Ducal Palace: 18, 55, 63, 66, 70, 73, 87, 194 f., capitals, 159, 162, chapel, 70; Museo Patriarcale, Adoration of Magi, 184 f.; palaces, 102 f.; Piazza San Marco, 101 ff.; Piazzetta, columns, 22, 85, 117 f., 162
 Vercelli, S. Andrea, 152
 Verona, 110; Church of, 31; San Zeno, pontile, 172
 Vices, allegories of, 157
 Vienna, Este collection, 168, 173
 Viollet Le Duc, E. E., 196
 Virgin, Aniketos, 187 f.; Blacherniotissa, 27, 125; Eleousa, 187; Hodegetria, 27, 189; Kyriotissa, 125; Nikopeia, 27, 123; Orant, 123 ff., 131 f.
 Virtues, allegories of, 157 ff., 163, 183
 Vitale Michiel II, doge, 25
- Westwerk, 48
 William II, King of Sicily, 25, 48 f.
 Willigelmus, sculptor, 151
 Wolfer, patriarch, 40
- Xene, see Ricta
 Xeropotamou, relief of St. Demetrius, 129
- Zandomeneghi, Federico, 196
 Zara, son of Judah, 40
 Zechariah, 5
 Zendrini, Bernardino, Proto di San Marco, 195 f.
 Zeno, Battista, cardinal, 79 f., 187
 Zeno, Marino, Podesta of Constantinople, 27
 Zeno, Ranieri, doge, 14, 18, 51, 54, 173
 Zerlaga, Antonio, Proto di San Marco, 194
 Ziani, Pietro, doge, 24, 26
 Ziani, Sebastiano, doge, 22, 25
 Zodiac, signs of, 153 ff.
 Zorzi, Alvise, 197
 Zuccareda, Roberto, Proto di San Marco, 196

